

as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1047. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Brooklyn Tuberculosis and Health Association, Bureau of Charities, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of proposed amendment to title 5, part 4, of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1048. Also, petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, New York City, concerning House bill 2203; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1049. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of William Short and others, petitioning the Congress to effect passage of the Townsend general welfare bill (H. R. 2) without compromise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1050. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the Logan Coal Operators Association, of Logan, W. Va., favoring an increase in the import-duty tax on foreign oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1051. By Mr. TOLAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the Congress to refuse to enact Senate Joint Resolution 24, or any other bill or resolution which may similarly seek to establish the asserted claim of the Federal Government to any title or interest in such submerged lands or tidelands of the State of California, other than such lands which may have been heretofore expressly granted it by this State or under its authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1052. Also, petition of the City Council of Berkeley, Calif., requesting that the Congress reject the doctrine embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 24, that the Federal Government may not attempt to proceed against the several States and assert title to submerged lands now adjacent to the shores of those several States; and authorizing the city manager of Berkeley, Calif., to appear before the committees of Congress and oppose such legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1053. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of California, requesting the Congress of the United States take such steps as are necessary, and the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation are requested, to name the lake which will result from the construction of Shasta Dam at Kennett, Calif., "McCull Lake"; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1054. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the Congress of the United States to amend the California Indian Jurisdictional Act of 1928 to provide for nontreaty Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1055. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of California to the Congress and the President, urging the passage of legislation that will make it imperative that the Works Progress Administration art project be continued in its present form; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1056. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging Congress to enact legislation that will result in the increase of Federal aid to aged and disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1057. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the Congress to include the construction of dams and hydroelectric power plants in connection therewith on the Kern River as one of the Federal construction projects, and that Federal moneys be appropriated in sums sufficient to complete the constructions of the dams and other works therewith at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*God be merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us.*

*That Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations.*

*Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee.*

*O let the nations be glad and sing for joy; for Thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon earth.*

*Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee.*

*Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless us.*

*God shall bless us; and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him.*

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### HOURLY OF MEETING

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, after consulting with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I understand the majority leader wishes to finish this bill, that is now pending, on tomorrow night?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is the desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And after that we are to take up the legislative appropriation bill and finish it this week?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there anything else on the docket?

Mr. RAYBURN. Nothing that I know of now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of George R. Holmes, one of Washington's most distinguished newspapermen, came as a great shock to his many friends in his profession and in official and private life.

Mr. Holmes was stricken in the zenith of his life. Suffering a heart attack, he died at his home on February 12. True to the tenets of his profession, he had worked diligently to the end. He left his office but a few hours before his death.

It is a notable tribute to his talents and character that great and humble joined in a tribute to his memory in the Fort Myer Chapel and accompanied the body to its resting place near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. It was fitting that he should lie in Arlington National Cemetery. He trained at Fort Myer for service in the World War.

The rise of George R. Holmes is typical of the success which is possible in a great democratic nation. Born on a farm in Tippecanoe County, Ind., on January 28, 1895, he knew the rigors of work in the fields and doubtless dreamed of great cities beyond the horizon.

After being educated in local schools and at the University of Wisconsin, he entered the newspaper field on the Indianapolis Sun. His talents readily became apparent, and soon he had transferred his activities to New York.

Joining the staff of International News Service in Washington in 1916, he became chief of the bureau 3 years later. At his death he ranked as dean of press association bureau chiefs.

His newspaper work was interrupted by the World War. When the war broke out, he enlisted in the Cavalry. He served throughout the war, first gaining the rank of second lieutenant in the Cavalry, next assistant adjutant of the Seventy-eighth Division, then as observer in the Two Hundred and Fifty-eighth Aero Squadron.

Among his accomplishments in the newspaper field was his story of the burial of the Unknown Soldier, a touching story which won him a Pulitzer prize honorable mention.

Mr. Holmes, in the course of his work, knew intimately Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt. He was the friend of many Cabinet officers and Senators and Representatives of varying political faith.

Among those who mourned for him at funeral services were both Republican and Democratic political leaders, leaders of the legal and other professions. Both President and Mrs. Roosevelt joined in expressing their deep sorrow.

As a political writer, Mr. Holmes was confronted with the task of giving his millions of readers a true picture of the national situation without bias.

He was widely known for his ability to do so without arousing the animosity of those who necessarily figured in the news. This is evidenced by the fact that he held the friendship of rivals in the political field.

Mr. Holmes' life work is a sterling example to those who seek achievement in the field of journalism. He was able, alert, and a keen observer. And above all, he was fair and just. These many fine characteristics, as well as his engaging personality, won for him a legion of warm friends. The respect of his colleagues in his profession of journalism was indicated by his choice as president of the famed Gridiron Club.

Newspaperdom and the country can ill afford the loss of men like George Holmes, particularly in this crucial period when America needs men of courage, of vision, and character.

The world is poorer for the untimely death of this great journalist. Those of us privileged to call him a friend, mourn his loss.

#### INCOME-TAX REFUNDS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is worthy of special mention when it can be shown the Bureau of Internal Revenue collected 10 times as much in additional assessments and penalties than it was forced to refund in the last fiscal year.

As chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments I released yesterday to the press the report for the fiscal year 1938 of refunds which you referred to the committee. This report, required under the provisions of section 5, of the act of May 29, 1928, shows refunds of \$500 or more of internal revenue taxes. It was made clear by me that this report represents amounts that have been paid taxpayers during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and not amounts that are to be hereafter refunded.

Mr. Speaker, the statement submitted to the committee lists only those taxpayers who received in excess of \$500. The total amount of income-tax refunds paid during the fiscal year, which total includes many amounts smaller than \$500 and not required to be reported to Congress, was \$24,329,415.27. This amount included interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of the overpayment to the approximate date of refund. The number of taxpayers who received income tax refunds was 159,233.

I am advised that the more common errors of taxpayers which resulted in overpayments of income taxes, according to the records of the Department, were: Mathematical errors, the reporting of nontaxable income, failure to take credit for foreign taxes, and failure to take proper credit for depreciation and obsolescence of physical properties. The larger refunds to a considerable extent are based upon final decisions of courts or the Board of Tax Appeals and/or determinations by the Treasury Department based upon decisions by courts or the Board of Tax Appeals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I point out that during the fiscal year 1938 the actual cash collections on account of back income taxes amounted to \$251,619,229.50, an amount in excess of 10 times the total of actual cash refunds of income taxes.

In connection with the statement that income-tax refunds for 1938 totaled slightly in excess of \$24,000,000, I also call attention to the fact that for the fiscal year 1938 the total of the cash paid out for all classes of refunds and interest thereon was in excess of \$34,000,000; for the fiscal year 1932 the comparable items amounted to in excess of \$80,000,000; for the year 1931, it was nearly \$70,000,000; for 1930, more than \$126,000,000; and for the year 1929, more than \$190,000,000 was paid. The large expenditures in past years had been occasioned, to a considerable extent, by the relief provisions and by the complexity of the tax laws during the excess-profits tax years, and due to overpayment because of an initial lack of understanding of the provisions of the taxing statutes enacted as an incident to the World War.

The refunds to payers of processing taxes, totaling \$10,200,359.64 during the fiscal year 1938 (the items over \$500 being included in the report), did not in fact or to any material extent represent erroneous collections, since the statute levying the tax directed the return of that portion of the tax collected on articles exported, or sold for charitable use, or on cotton used in the manufacture of large cotton bags. The processing taxes statute did not provide for exempting articles from taxation as usually was the method in respect of other internal revenue taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this brief explanation so that the Congress and the people of the country will know that everything is not going out and nothing coming in. I might add in conclusion the law does not permit the Bureau of Internal Revenue to make public the names and amounts of additional collections as it does in reference to refunds. [Applause.]

#### THE LATE POPE PIUS XI

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the passing of Pope Pius.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of Pope Pius XI comes as a great shock to the people of the entire world. While not unexpected, because of the severe and protracted illness he so valiantly underwent, it has nevertheless caused universal sorrow.

I am sure that history will accord to this sainted pontiff an exalted place among his predecessors and will record that his frail hand deterred the onslaught of barbarism on this earth.

His was a life replete with unselfish service to God, church, and mankind. Of humble origin, he was endowed with a brilliant mind and great love of humanity which he devoted to the service of God, thereby dedicating himself to the needs of his fellow man.

In the service of the Roman Catholic Church he consummated treaties that were masterful in their diplomatic achievements and historic in their significance. The Lateran Treaty with the Government of Italy brought to a mutually satisfactory and beneficial ending an ancient dispute. The concordat with the present Government of Germany has unquestionably operated to check persecution in Germany, not alone of the Roman Catholic Church but of all Christian religion. His achievements in the advancement of the church are great and unsurpassed.

Born in an Italian mill community, he learned from his boyhood associations the crying needs of those who labor and, after a lifetime of exhaustive study and work, he brought forth his inspired encyclicals on labor which rank with those of his illustrious predecessor, Pope Leo XIII.

An eyewitness in Poland to the lawless invasion of the armies of communism and an ideological principal in the historic event that hurled back from western Europe the spread of communism, he wrote with the penetrating eye of direct knowledge the encyclical on atheistic communism which has thrown the full light of truth and reason upon the illusory promises of that form of government.

Perhaps his greatest contribution to universal mankind was his steadfast and unflinching position with respect to the emergence of new ideologies in government, inimical

to and in derogation of fundamental principles of Christianity.

Enfeebled by long illness, with no armies, navies, or vast material resources at his command, this slender reed has stood out in a world torn with hatred, jealousy, and avarice as a compelling symbol of peace, toleration, and universal love. His frail voice rose above the din of war machines and the clamor of propaganda, steadfastly preaching the teachings of the Saviour. Weakened though it was by illness, his voice carried to the peoples of the world words of mighty import because inspired by God and reason, and gave pause to the headlong march of militarism and international lawlessness.

In a world shocked by the recrudescence of persecution and legalized atrocity, sorrowed by the imminence of devastating war, wearied by the sufferings of economic disorders, he has stood forth as the untemperizing voice of reason and the symbol of hope and faith in God and mankind.

When at last he realized that death drew near, his only protest was "there is still so much to be done." And when death claimed him a prayer for peace was on his lips.

He has laid down the great burdens he so heroically bore through life. His voice is stilled but there is hope that his task is complete. There is hope that even now the mold of decay is undermining the weeds of barbarism and savagery that have harried this earth; that even now the seeds of a new world order devoted to Christian principles are growing into maturity. Inevitably that day must come. When it arrives it will in no small measure be due to the fruition of the life work of Pope Pius XI.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the disposition of the legislative business for the day, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### THE FISCAL SITUATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we heard a moment ago about collecting income taxes of a few hundred million dollars. There was a Democratic caucus this morning, and I suppose the Democratic administration has found some way whereby we are going to balance the Budget, a weighty question in our national life. I want to call your attention to the fact that we are \$2,033,000,000 in the red from July 1 to this time this year. If the administration in power today would give some time to considering how we are going to stop spending and balance the Budget, we could do it. I say to the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the aisle, if you do not stop reckless spending, "Where are you going to get the money?"

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. There is one special order for Thursday.

Mr. COX. Subject to the special order already entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record by inserting a very brief but very informative discussion of industrial conditions in this country.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio address delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Church], under the auspices of the Washington Star in its national radio forum last evening on the subject of our national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barton].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein three memorials passed by the Legislature of the State of Montana: First, House Joint Memorial No. 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America for the passage of the legislation for the creation and establishment of the Townsend recovery plan, and for benefits to be paid to all persons over the age of 60 years.

Second, a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, House Joint Memorial No. 3, requesting an investigation of the wrongful destruction, removal, and failure to replace the fairground buildings of the county of Musselshell, and thereafter cause restitution of the same, said buildings having been wrongfully destroyed and removed by authority of the National Park Service.

Third, House Joint Memorial No. 7, a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, requesting it to assist the beet-sugar industry in Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

#### A PLANNED PROGRAM OF PUBLIC WORKS AND WHY IT SHOULD BE PERMANENTLY CONTINUED

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record at this point on the subject A Planned Program of Public Works and Why the P. W. A. Should Be Permanently Continued.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Members of the House seriously consider the advisability of creating a permanent bureau for public works. We can never hope to establish a balance between industrial production and consumption—there will continue to be fluctuations which result in peaks and below normal activities. We can also expect physical disasters, such as floods, fires, earthquakes, droughts, in various parts of the country, with which the Government will have to cope. Communities stricken by such disaster will call upon the Government for financial aid to repair the damages. It seems to me that all of these things seriously affect our employment and security problems. It has been proposed that a Federal agency be established of a permanent nature which could go into action when industrial consumption declines below the danger level and avert economic catastrophes which so easily follow such declines.

The work undertaken in the past by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works has been so helpful in time of economic emergency that its usefulness must be continued on a permanent basis. California has benefited to such an extent that the gains in industrial activity jumped to a new peak in recent months when the new P. W. A. program started. The P. W. A. program in California has been successful not merely because it has resulted in putting more money into circulation but because it has the enthusiastic cooperation of local communities, private industry, and the labor unions. Local communities have had a voice in determining what form municipal improvements would take. Private industry has been encouraged and aided. Private employment has been provided at regu-

lar industrial and construction jobs. Labor has had the benefit of normal working conditions, stable wages, and the provision of work in the individual trades.

Involved in the public-works program are jobs for our building-trades workers, the spread of purchasing power, expansion of factory pay rolls, and, probably what is equally important, the recovery of our whole economic system.

In April 1936 Mr. M. J. Collieran, president of the Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers International Association, spoke in behalf of a permanent public-works program as follows:

What I refer to, of course, is the principle of long-range planning for public-works construction.

The idea that public or public-aided construction is a major weapon of any modern government against unemployment and depression has been generally recognized for so long that I do not need to dwell on it. That such construction ought to be planned and timed in order to provide a cushion of employment when most needed has likewise been a matter of general agreement. But, still, in spite of all the talk, and in spite of the large sums actually spent on public-works construction during the past 4 years by various temporary Federal agencies, no permanent machinery has been set up which could plan out a long-range future program of construction.

Way back in 1921 Mr. Herbert Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce, and in a special capacity as chairman of a committee on unemployment, presented an eight-point report to President Harding. The main point in this report was the long-range planning of public works. It recommended the immediate appointment of a committee to take up the problem of planning and carrying out a long-range program of public-works construction to offset future depressions. This committee, however, failed to function.

We see, therefore, that the subject is one which has been discussed for many years. I see no reason for continuing the present Public Works Administration as an emergency temporary agency. We know that such an agency will be needed always and that we need not hesitate to make it permanent in view of its splendid accomplishments in controlling fluctuation in production.

While the Congress is considering ways and means of alleviating unemployment in the future, consideration should be given to a permanent plan for absorbing future economic shocks and unavoidable unemployment. Converting the Public Works Administration into a permanent organization would remove the present emergency time restrictions under which that agency is now operating and permit it to function on a long planned range basis. It seems logical and to the best interests of the country to do this. Certainly an organization which operates on a permanent basis can operate more efficiently and economically.

We have been concerned in the past with the "cure" of economic ills of the Nation and have had little opportunity to inquire into the "cause" of such ills. It is now time to concentrate our efforts and resources to combat the "cause" and thus remove the need for temporary measures. Permanent social-security machinery has already been put in operation to provide economic security for the workers of our country through social insurance. The functioning of this machinery will go far to take care of our unemployables and those who are temporarily unemployed. But there is no permanent machinery in existence to care for those who are unemployed for long periods of time. Long-range planning in the field of public works presents one solution to this problem.

The Public Works Administration is to be congratulated upon its fine record of achievement. I have yet to hear any adverse criticism of its operations. Considering the many restrictions that have been placed upon its activities by the emergency legislation under which it has been functioning it is remarkable that it has been able to operate so efficiently and smoothly. Various "dead lines" have been imposed for receiving and approving applications. Other restrictions made it necessary for the work to be started at certain dates and completed in certain periods. These mandates of the Congress have always been fulfilled and construction has proceeded promptly and efficiently. Such restrictions, however, would not be necessary or expedient under a planned program of public works, thus eliminating any possibility of material and contract price boosts.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity for such legislation at this time is too obvious to demand further elaboration. I firmly believe that industrial rehabilitation is dependent upon a planned program of permanent character.

Mr. MAGNUSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the legislative program for today I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the conclusion of the legislative program for the day I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have already held up for 4 days the consideration of the national-defense bill that is to come before the House today. It is very necessary that we proceed to the consideration of this bill. I hope no other Members will request time to speak now. I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin, for he has already made it, but I serve notice that I must object to other requests of a similar nature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### NEUTRALITY AND PEACE

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, in America today we again hear the cry of war. We hear that events abroad are threatening our American institutions. We are told that we must prepare for defense against some unnamed nation somewhere. It is said that we cannot be assured of peace in a world which has grown small and methods of attack swift. We are led to believe that we cannot ignore foreign acts which are contradictory to our democratic principles and beliefs; that it becomes increasingly impossible for us to maintain a neutral position; that we should arm and employ sanctions against aggressors. The utterances coming from administration sources are creating a war hysteria which finds no parallel during the last 20 years.

Let not the White House forget that the underlying sentiment of the American people is for peace. There is an overwhelming desire among Americans to keep our country out of war. There is no wish anywhere for a tragic repetition of the events of 1917 and 1918. There are those who remember the horrors of the last war—a war presumably waged to make the world safe for democracy. How deceived we were! Instead of democracy we begot fascism and communism. That must not happen again.

Through the creation of a war consciousness, through criticism of other forms of government, through ill will and resentment toward other people, through preparation for war, through the adoption of methods short of war but stronger and more effective than words, our Nation will drift into a position from which it will not recede, and war will be inevitable. It is the privilege and the duty of Congress to give to America an assurance that strict neutrality will be maintained so that the American people will enjoy a well-founded and lasting peace.

There is much confusion about the meaning of the term "neutrality." In popular thought neutrality means simply keeping out of war—the condition of those who remain at peace while others are fighting. From a more technical viewpoint, neutrality has meant a legal status involving certain rights and duties. For my purposes, I prefer to use the term "strict neutrality." By this is meant no contact with a warring nation; no transmission of war materials to a

warring nation; and no transmission of food, clothing, or any other supplies if we are served with an ultimatum to such effect by any belligerent nation.

Any discussion of the meaning of neutrality must state the relation between neutrality and the defense problem. An air force, landed force, and naval force sufficient to protect our territory from sudden attack is all that is necessary. A large standing army, a huge navy, a powerful air fleet engender the courage to enter into war upon the slightest pretext.

There is no more fallacious belief than that the best way to preserve peace is to prepare for war. From the days of the Roman militaristic rule to the period preceding the World War history clearly demonstrates that when a nation is well armed and its military forces well trained it will seek outlets to make use of those arms.

An excessive defense program will increase the likelihood of our becoming involved in foreign disputes, will make it more difficult to adhere to a policy of strict neutrality. Our national defense must be adequate for the protection of our own territories, but it must not be extravagant to the point of leading us into war. How much better it would be if all our energies were directed toward improving the internal conditions of this country. How much more sane, how much more civilized it would be if our money were spent on developing America for the American people, and not in the creation and maintenance of a vast army and navy. America must not join in the current armaments race, must not become infected with the "preparedness mania" which is the forerunner of war. We must keep our heads. Sanity promotes peace. Armaments create wars.

The United States, from the time of its inception, has had as an established principle of its foreign policy the maintenance of neutrality. The part played by the United States in realizing the great conception of neutrality forms one of the most honorable chapters in our national history.

In spite of that fact our previous neutrality policy has not kept us out of war. The attempt to safeguard our so-called neutral rights was one of the factors which led us into the World War.

In August 1914 neutral nations and their citizens possessed certain rights of trade and otherwise on the high seas which may be said to have been generally recognized by belligerents—at least in theory. Then came the Great War and a series of acts by Great Britain, France, Italy, and Germany, every one of which was challenged by the American Government as a violation of our neutral rights—the planting of mines, the extensive sea war zones, destruction of our ships captured in midocean, unwarned sinking of our ships by submarines, forcing of our ships and our mails into belligerent ports for the purposes of search and seizure and censorship, the extension of contraband to cover foods and supplies to civil populations, and the taking of persons off of our ships. On April 16, 1917, not one of our contentions had been accepted by the belligerents, not one neutral right asserted by us had been granted by them as a right. At the end of the war no definite neutral rights were established and recognized by the great powers. Today not a single contention advanced by us is recognized by Great Britain, France, or Germany to any greater extent than between 1914 and 1917.

In the light of history we can now see that in addition to other factors, such as financial involvement and emotional pressure, one of the motivating forces which drove us into the last war was our futile attempt to maintain certain neutral rights.

At Chicago in 1937 we heard the first indication that the President had definitely turned his back on the neutrality policy prescribed for him by Congress, a policy which he has refused to execute in relation to the Chinese war. Mr. Roosevelt accepts the thesis of those who believe in "collective security action"—that it is impossible to stay out of war; that, in fact, if international anarchy and aggression continue, we shall be attacked. Therefore, it is said it is necessary for the peace-loving nations to take positive measures against the aggressors and check them before it is too late.

If things proceed along this line the United States will be involved in a new world war.

The lack of confidence in our ability to remain neutral, displayed by the President, is peculiarly an American obsession. We became involved in the World War because there were strong interests who wanted us drawn in, but Holland and the Scandinavian countries, infinitely more harassed than the United States, were perfectly able to remain neutral and still enjoy the respect of belligerents and of historians.

No one tries to disguise the fact that genuine neutrality will cost us a great deal. The price of peace is high and will require many sacrifices. But let no man forget that the cost of war is immeasurably higher.

We must be willing to take the losses in trade and investments which cannot be avoided, in order to escape the greater economic losses which follow in the wake of war. If our country is to remain at peace, our trade as a neutral must be at the risk of the trader. Our Army and Navy must not be used to protect this trade. We cannot keep out of war and at the same time enforce the freedom to make profits out of countries in a death struggle.

The loss of temporary profits due to our remaining neutral during a foreign war, no matter how great, will be less than the loss of the economic stability of our entire country which follows as the aftermath of war.

In addition to monetary sacrifice necessitated by the maintenance of neutrality, Americans must be willing to forego the personal desire of seeing justice triumph all over the world. We will doubtless be ridiculed and stamped as cowardly, told that we should be ashamed of our selfish policy. Our sympathies will be appealed to by strong emotional tales of oppression. But we must stand firm, we must let no pressure of propaganda swerve us to one side or the other. Are we not willing to give up a measure of our pride in order that we may save our tears, our lives, and our blood?

Many will say that we are selfishly preserving ourselves while others are fighting for civilization. But actions are judged, in any realistic view, not by the emotions behind them, but by their results. You cannot end war by waging war, defeat totalitarianism by defeating totalitarian nations at war. Victory for civilization is too complex an achievement to be won by drilling soldiers and dropping air bombs. Whatever contribution to civilization we can make, will be completely ruined by letting the world catastrophe spread within our borders. To keep isolated from this contagion is as difficult, heroic, and positive a contribution to the future of humanity as can well be conceived.

The cost of war is vast and prolonged. It is counted in human suffering, death, and destruction of morale as well as in industrial collapse, financial losses, and foreign debts which are never paid. If escaping these costs means sacrifice of financial profits, if it means sacrifice of pride, we must make those sacrifices willingly in order that our country may be safe from the infectious hand of war, that we may live in a land in which peace and happiness can never be challenged.

In view of the present foreign situation, the defense controversy, and the war-mindedness of some of our people, it behooves us to face realities. Unless we take steps to keep out of war, unless we stop to consider where our present policy is leading us, we may find that our predicted "rendezvous with destiny" will be a rendezvous with death.

America's first consideration must be the formulation of a definite plan to keep out of war.

In the past the American neutrality policy has drawn this country into great wars because of the irritating contacts with belligerents and their operations. From this premise it logically follows that if we reduce these contacts we reduce the chances of becoming involved in a war. We must abandon the protection of our so-called neutral rights and maintain strict isolation from contacts with warring nations. Such a program offers our only promise of peace. Nothing

short of total isolation is full assurance of the success of such a plan.

Our present Neutrality Act should be made stronger, and enforcement thereof should begin automatically with the opening of hostilities, without reference to whether war is declared or not. It is quite possible that the world will never again see a formal declaration of war.

The primary object of neutrality is to stay out of war. If war can be prevented, well and good; if it breaks out between other countries, the United States should stay out. If, as a nation, we are willing to go out and fight the battles of the weak and oppressed all over the world it is better to avow that policy and prepare for it, instead of sliding into it under some other guise. Neutrality should cease to be a road to war and be a road to peace.

There is every reason to believe that the people of the United States prefer a national policy which promotes peace rather than war. A strict neutrality policy will give America that peace. [Applause.]

#### APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 92

Resolved, That CHARLES F. RISK, of Rhode Island, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Pensions of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address which I delivered last evening over a nation-wide network.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a 10-line quotation from Commercial Policy, Series No. 27, of the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram which I have just received from the superintendent of public relief in the city of Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER]?

There was no objection.

#### THE PUBLIC SALARY TAX ACT OF 1939

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 93

Resolution providing that the Senate be requested to return the bill H. R. 3790 to the House of Representatives for such further consideration as the House of Representatives may deem proper

Whereas in the Revenue Act of 1926 there was established the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to be composed of 10 members, 5 of whom are members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, 3 from the majority party and 2 from the minority party, to be chosen by said committee; and 5 members who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, 3 from the majority party and 2 from minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

Whereas it is the legal duty of this joint committee to investigate the operation and effects of the Federal system of internal-revenue taxes; to investigate the administration of such taxes by the Bureau of Internal Revenue or any executive department, establishment, or agency charged with their administration; to make such other investigations in respect to such system of taxes as the joint committee may deem necessary; to investigate measures and methods for the simplification of such taxes, particularly the

income tax; to publish, from time to time, for public examination and analysis, proposed measures and methods for the simplification of such taxes, and to report, from time to time, to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Ways and Means and, in its discretion, to the Senate or to the House of Representatives, or both, the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it might deem advisable; and

Whereas the present membership of this Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is composed of the following members: Hon. Pat Harrison, Mississippi; Hon. William H. King, Utah; Hon. Walter F. George, Georgia; Hon. Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Wisconsin; Hon. Arthur Capper, Kansas, all Members of the United States Senate; Hon. Robert L. Doughton (chairman), North Carolina; Hon. Thomas H. Cullen, New York; Hon. John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Hon. Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts; Hon. Frank Crowther, New York, all Members of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas Colin F. Stam is chief of staff of the said Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and has certain technical assistants, a statistician, and attorneys of expert ability; and

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt in messages to the Congress on April 25, 1938, and January 19, 1939, recommended legislation which would subject to Federal and State income-tax statutes the interest paid on future issues of Federal, State, and municipal bonds, and the salaries of Federal, State, and municipal officers and employees; and

Whereas, subsequent to the President's message of April 25, 1938, at the request of the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice undertook a study of the problems and transmitted its report to the Treasury Department on June 24, 1938; and

Whereas the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, under the direction of the Congress and with the assistance of its staff of experts, also undertook an investigation and study of these same tax proposals; and

Whereas the question of the constitutionality of the legislation proposed by the President was studied by an agency of the executive branch of the Government and by an agency of the Congress; and

Whereas the studies and conclusions of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department were reported to the Senate Finance Committee, the special Senate Committee on Taxation of Government Securities and Salaries and the Special Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation were made available to several libraries, the press, and, in general, to all persons interested, these studies and conclusions thus having a wide circulation in the Congress and throughout the country previous to the action of the House on H. R. 3790; and

Whereas the report of the Department of Justice was placed before each member of the Ways and Means Committee when H. R. 3790 was being considered, and a synopsis thereof made available to all Members of Congress; and

Whereas a representative of the Department of Justice discussed the constitutionality of H. R. 3790 before the Ways and Means Committee and submitted himself to cross-examination; and

Whereas, although he admitted that he was not free from doubt as to the constitutionality of H. R. 3790, he nevertheless urged the enactment of this legislation; and

Whereas the staff of experts of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation had made an exhaustive study and report, which was "printed for the examination and use of the members of the committee," meaning the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; and

Whereas there appears on the title page of this report this language: "Note.—This report has been ordered printed for purposes of information and discussion, but it has not yet been considered or approved by the committee or any member thereof"; and

Whereas Government Printing Office officials have stated that this report was printed and delivered to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation on January 15, 1939; and

Whereas the members of the Ways and Means Committee, at least the minority members thereof, and other Members of the House of Representatives, were denied access to this report and had no knowledge of it, and were thus deprived of the benefit of the investigations and conclusions of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, while the Ways and Means Committee was considering H. R. 3790; and

Whereas the first intimation the Members of the House had of the existence of this report was through an item concerning it published in a Washington newspaper on February 10, 1939, the day after H. R. 3790 was passed; the newspaper article referred to this report as having been mentioned in a Senate hearing on the very day the House of Representatives debated and passed H. R. 3790; and

Whereas this report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation states on page 47 thereof: "It appears that the only way all of the salaries of State and political subdivision officers and employees could be reached by the Federal Government, and all the salaries of Federal officers and employees could be reached by the State governments, is by a constitutional amendment"; and

Whereas this conclusion by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation undoubtedly would have had great influence and bearing upon the final action of the House of Representatives concerning H. R. 3790; and

Whereas the members of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House of Representatives were thus deprived of the studies and conclusions of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal

Revenue Taxation, although their report had been printed and delivered 25 days previous to the consideration of H. R. 3790 by the House of Representatives; and

Whereas copies of this printed report have not yet been made generally available to the Members of the House of Representatives, although they have been printed since January 15, 1939; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has been given no reason why the printed copies of this report were ignored, neglected, or sequestered until H. R. 3790 had been passed by the House of Representatives; and

Whereas no explanation has been offered why the Ways and Means Committee was denied the benefit of these investigations and conclusions of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, although the Ways and Means Committee did not begin its hearings on H. R. 3790 until January 26, 1939, 11 days after the report had been printed and delivered to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and although the report of the investigations, conclusions, and opinions of the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice, representing the executive branch of the Government, were, during this time, brought to the attention of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, the House of Representatives, and the press; and

Whereas the Members of the House of Representatives who voted on H. R. 3790 were thus denied the benefit of the research and conclusions of the staff of its own agency, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; and

Whereas knowledge of this report of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation might have affected the votes of some Members of the House of Representatives, and might have altered the action of the House by which the bill was passed; and

Whereas the ignoring, neglecting, or sequestering of this report impaired the ability of the Members of the House of Representatives to fulfill their oaths of office to uphold and defend the Constitution by due exercise of study and judgment of legislation which they might believe to be in violation of the Constitution; and

Whereas such action in ignoring, neglecting, or sequestering pertinent and important information bearing upon the constitutionality of legislation did adversely affect the safety, dignity, and integrity of proceedings of the House of Representatives, and of the Members thereof; and

Whereas such ignoring, neglect, or sequestration of this report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has had the effect of concealment to deceive, mislead, and cause the Members to vote, with a lack of adequate and available information upon an important tax measure of questionable constitutionality; and

Whereas such ignoring, neglect, or sequestration of a report to a standing committee of this Congress, pertinent to pending legislation, if deliberate, is utterly indefensible and in violation of constitutional procedure in the Congress; and

Whereas the belated knowledge of this report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has placed many Members of the House of Representatives in an embarrassing and humiliating position; and

Whereas Hon. DANIEL A. REED, of New York, a minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, and other Members of the House, raised the question of the constitutionality of the legislation during the debates on H. R. 3790, calling attention to the fact that a fundamental constitutional question affecting the sovereignty and independence of the several States of the Union was involved; these Members contending that the objectives sought by the legislation could be achieved only by a constitutional amendment; this contention would have been fully supported and confirmed by the aforementioned report had it not been concealed from the Members of the House; and

Whereas the ignoring, neglecting, or concealing of the aforementioned report constitutes a denial to the Members of the House of Representatives of their official rights and privileges; and

Whereas the said H. R. 3790, having been passed by the House, has been sent to the Senate for its consideration: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate be, and is hereby, requested through the proper channels to return H. R. 3790 to the House of Representatives for such further consideration as it may deem proper.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the resolution is not privileged. I think it is clear that there is no irregularity, either in the preamble or in any part of this resolution, that would vitiate the action of the House. I think, therefore, it is not a privileged resolution, and I make the point of order it is not a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] makes the point of order that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is not a privileged resolution.

Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard briefly. There has been set forth in the resolution a clear case of impropriety on the part of someone. I have been very care-

ful not to charge that this was done with deliberation. I should like to think it was by inadvertence or oversight; but, nevertheless, the fact remains there was available in a standing committee of this House a report which had a direct bearing upon important legislation involving a constitutional question which was not made known to Members. Although I am cognizant of the fact that the mere request by a Member without any substantiating evidence is not sufficient for the House to request the return of a bill from the Senate, the fact that there is an allegation of impropriety which might be shown in the debate to actually exist is sufficient ground to justify the House in requesting the return of this legislation.

The legislation was passed in the House by inadvertence because the Members of the House were denied information which otherwise would have been available to them had not this report been concealed from the Members of the House. There is a grave question of the integrity of this House involved as well as the dignity of the Members. The only way this can be corrected in a legislative manner is to have the bill returned from the Senate to the House for such further consideration as the House may see fit to give to it. I may say if the bill is returned to the House, it is my purpose to ask that the motion by which the motion to recommit the bill was laid on the table be taken from the table and the bill reconsidered in the light of this report which was sequestered and concealed from the Members at the time the bill was passed.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this involves at least a moral duty to the people of this Nation who should have some assurance that this House is doing its constitutional duty with respect to important legislation. If there is no precedent for this action on the part of the House, I think the House today should establish the precedent that where there is made a prima facie case of impropriety in connection with bills passed by this House, we should as a matter of course request the Senate to return such bills here for the correction of any errors that might have been involved in the action taken.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan offers a resolution providing that the Senate be requested to return the bill H. R. 3790 to the House of Representatives for such further consideration as the House of Representatives may deem proper.

A reading of the subsequent allegations contained in the preamble seems to support the idea that the gravamen of the objection made by the gentleman from Michigan is that in the course of the performance of its duty the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation failed to offer to or conceal from certain Members of the House Committee on Ways and Means the study compiled by its staff with reference to the constitutionality of the statute seeking to tax the salaries of State officials. The gentleman from Michigan in his argument rather tacitly admitted he had grave doubts as to whether or not under the usual rules and precedents of the House the facts stated justified the submission of the resolution as involving privileges of the House.

The Chair is very clearly of the opinion that one or two precedents, which are found in *Hinds' Precedents*, volume 4, sections 3477 and 3478, lay down sufficient guidance for the Chair in determining this question.

On August 6, 1856, an order directing the Clerk to request the Senate to return the Mississippi land bill in order that an error in engrossment might be corrected, was offered by unanimous consent, and does not seem to have been contemplated in the light of a privileged proposition.

In the other precedent, Mr. Speaker Crisp, in interpreting the question of whether or not matter of this sort constituted a privileged proposition, said:

If the gentleman from Indiana would modify his resolution so as to allege that this bill was reported unfavorably from the Committee of the Whole, and was considered by the House under the idea that it had been favorably reported, the Chair thinks the resolution would be privileged. But a simple resolution to recall a bill can hardly be considered privileged, because in that case such a resolution might be presented with regard to any

bill that is passed. To make the resolution privileged, it should show that the House has acted under some misunderstanding of the report of the Committee—

The Chair interpolates there that he assumes that was a report of a Committee of the Whole—  
or something of that kind.

The fact suggested that all Members of the House were deprived of the benefits of the legal opinion formulated by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation does not justify the Chair in assuming that, even if they had had such information, it would have changed the vote of the House. The Chair recollects that this particular problem of the constitutionality of this bill from the Committee on Ways and Means was very ably debated on the floor of the House.

Under the rules and under the precedents the Chair has suggested, although the Chair realizes there are cases in which it might be proper to offer a resolution to recall a bill for some clerical misprision or for some patent misstatement of the Record, the Chair is of the opinion that this matter does not present a privileged resolution and, therefore, sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House and offer a resolution that I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I may say in fairness to the Speaker and the House that the substance—

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Let us hear what this resolution is before we have any statement about it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then in order to get to the point I was trying to make, to save time, I ask unanimous consent that all of the resolution with the exception of the resolving clause be considered as read, it being identical with the resolution recently submitted asking that the bill be returned.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report primarily the resolution itself.

Will the Clerk, for the information of the Chair, read the resolving clause of the resolution?

The Clerk read as follows:

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the acts and omissions herein charged constitute a question of privilege affecting the safety, dignity, and integrity of the proceedings of this House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is submitting a point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I submit the point of order the gentleman is making is not in order until some disposition is made of the reading of the resolution. I was about to clarify the matter by asking unanimous consent that all of the resolution, with the exception of the resolving clause, be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RANKIN. I object to that, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe this material, if it is not relevant, ought to go in the Record.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is going to lose time by objecting.

Mr. RANKIN. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 94

Whereas in the Revenue Act of 1926 there was established the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to be composed of 10 members, 5 of whom are members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, 3 from the majority party and 2 from the minority party, to be chosen by said committee; and 5 members who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of

Representatives, 3 from the majority party and 2 from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

Whereas it is the legal duty of this joint committee to investigate the operation and effects of the Federal system of internal-revenue taxes; to investigate the administration of such taxes by the Bureau of Internal Revenue or any executive department, establishment, or agency, charged with their administration; to make such other investigations in respect of such system of taxes as the joint committee may deem necessary; to investigate measures and methods for the simplification of such taxes, particularly the income tax; to publish, from time to time, for public examination and analysis, proposed measures and methods for the simplification of such taxes, and to report, from time to time, to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Ways and Means, and, in its discretion, to the Senate or to the House of Representatives, or both, the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it might deem advisable; and

Whereas the present membership of this Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is composed of the following members: Hon. Pat Harrison, Mississippi; Hon. William H. King, Utah; Hon. Walter F. George, Georgia; Hon. Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Wisconsin; Hon. Arthur Capper, Kansas, all Members of the United States Senate; Hon. Robert L. Doughton (chairman), North Carolina; Hon. Thomas H. Cullen, New York; Hon. John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Hon. Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts; and Hon. Frank Crowther, New York, all Members of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas Colin F. Stam is chief of staff of the said Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and has certain technical assistants, a statistician, and attorneys of expert ability; and

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt in messages to the Congress on April 25, 1938, and January 19, 1939, recommended legislation which would subject to Federal and State income-tax statutes the interest paid on future issues of Federal, State, and municipal bonds, and the salaries of Federal, State, and municipal officers and employees; and

Whereas subsequent to the President's message of April 25, 1938, at the request of the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice undertook a study of the problems, and transmitted its report to the Treasury Department on June 24, 1938; and

Whereas the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, under the direction of the Congress and with the assistance of its staff of experts, also undertook an investigation and study of these same tax proposals; and

Whereas the question of the constitutionality of the legislation proposed by the President was studied by an agency of the executive branch of the Government, and by an agency of the Congress; and

Whereas the studies and conclusions of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department were reported to the Senate Finance Committee, the Special Senate Committee on Taxation of Government Securities and Salaries, and the Special Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, were made available to several libraries, the press, and in general, to all persons interested, these studies and conclusions thus having a wide circulation in the Congress and throughout the country previous to the action of the House on H. R. 3790; and

Whereas the report of the Department of Justice was placed before each member of the Ways and Means Committee when H. R. 3790 was being considered, and a synopsis thereof made available to all Members of Congress; and

Whereas a representative of the Department of Justice discussed the constitutionality of H. R. 3790 before the Ways and Means Committee and submitted himself to cross-examination; and

Whereas although he admitted that he was not free from doubt as to the constitutionality of H. R. 3790, he nevertheless urged the enactment of this legislation; and

Whereas the staff of experts of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation had made an exhaustive study and report, which was "printed for the examination and use of the members of the committee," meaning the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; and

Whereas there appears on the title page of this report this language: "Note: This report has been ordered printed for purposes of information and discussion, but it has not yet been considered or approved by the committee or any member thereof"; and

Whereas Government Printing Office officials have stated that this report was printed and delivered to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation on January 15, 1939; and

Whereas the members of the Ways and Means Committee, at least the minority members thereof, and other Members of the House of Representatives, were denied access to this report and had no knowledge of it and were thus deprived of the benefit of the investigations and conclusions of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation while the Ways and Means Committee was considering H. R. 3790; and

Whereas the first intimation the Members of the House had of the existence of this report was through an item concerning it published in a Washington newspaper on February 10, 1939, the day after H. R. 3790 was passed; the newspaper article referred to this report as having been mentioned in a Senate hearing on the very day the House of Representatives debated and passed H. R. 3790; and

Whereas this report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation states on page 47 thereof: "It appears that the only way all of the salaries of State and political subdivision officers and

employees could be reached by the Federal Government, and all the salaries of Federal officers and employees could be reached by the State governments, is by a constitutional amendment"; and

Whereas this conclusion by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation undoubtedly would have had great influence and bearing upon the final action of the House of Representatives concerning H. R. 3790; and

Whereas the members of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House of Representatives were thus deprived of the studies and conclusions of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, although their report had been printed and delivered 25 days previous to the consideration of H. R. 3790 by the House of Representatives; and

Whereas copies of this printed report have not yet been made generally available to the Members of the House of Representatives, although they have been printed since January 15, 1939; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has been given no reason why the printed copies of this report were ignored, neglected, or sequestered until H. R. 3790 had been passed by the House of Representatives; and

Whereas no explanation has been offered why the Ways and Means Committee was denied the benefit of these investigations and conclusions of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, although the Ways and Means Committee did not begin its hearings on H. R. 3790 until January 26, 1939, 11 days after the report had been printed and delivered to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and although the report of the investigations, conclusions, and opinions of the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice, representing the executive branch of the Government were, during this time, brought to the attention of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, the House of Representatives, and the press; and

Whereas the Members of the House of Representatives who voted on H. R. 3790 were thus denied the benefit of the research and conclusions of the staff of its own agency, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; and

Whereas knowledge of this report of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation might have affected the votes of some Members of the House of Representatives, and might have altered the action of the House by which the bill was passed; and

Whereas the ignoring, neglecting, or sequestering of this report impaired the ability of the Members of the House of Representatives to fulfill their oaths of office to uphold and defend the Constitution by due exercise of study and judgment of legislation which they might believe to be in violation of the Constitution; and

Whereas such action in ignoring, neglecting, or sequestering pertinent and important information bearing upon the constitutionality of legislation did adversely affect the safety, dignity, and integrity of proceedings of the House of Representatives and of the Members thereof; and

Whereas such ignoring, neglect, or sequestration of this report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has had the effect of concealment to deceive, mislead, and cause the members to vote, with a lack of adequate and available information upon an important tax measure of questionable constitutionality; and

Whereas such ignoring neglect or sequestration of a report to a standing committee of this Congress, pertinent to pending legislation, if deliberate, is utterly indefensible and in violation of constitutional procedure in the Congress; and

Whereas the belated knowledge of this report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has placed many Members of the House of Representatives in an embarrassing and humiliating position; and

Whereas Hon. Daniel A. Reed, of New York, a minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, and other Members of the House raised the question of the constitutionality of the legislation during the debates on H. R. 3790, calling attention to the fact that a fundamental constitutional question affecting the sovereignty and independence of the several States of the Union was involved; these Members contending that the objectives sought by the legislation could be achieved only by a constitutional amendment; this contention would have been fully supported and confirmed by the aforementioned report had it not been concealed from the Members of the House; and

Whereas the ignoring, neglecting, or concealing of the aforementioned report constitutes a denial to the Members of the House of Representatives of their official rights and privileges; and

Whereas the said H. R. 3790, having been passed by the House, has been sent to the Senate for its consideration: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the acts and omissions herein charged constitute a question of privilege affecting the safety, dignity, and the integrity of the proceedings of this House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that the resolution is not privileged.

Mr. RAYBURN. For the same reason, stated formerly.

The SPEAKER. For the reasons as stated in the point of order against the original resolution.

Does the gentleman from Michigan care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Briefly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this presents a different question. This is a question affecting the privilege of the House. This is a question not involving a request to the Senate to return the bill to the House for consideration, but has to do primarily with the safety, the dignity of the Members of the House and the integrity of the proceedings of the House. If this resolution comes within any one of these classifications, if it makes out a prima facie case that the safety of this House, the dignity of this House, or the integrity of the proceedings of this House, has in any alleged manner been violated, then the resolution is in order.

In substantiation of the fact that this important committee report would have had a direct bearing on the result of the action taken by the House on legislation and that the denial of this report to the Members of the House prepared by the experts on the staff of one of its own committees has been a denial of rights and privileges attendant upon membership in this House, I want to read the last sentence of the report of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. That report, as alleged in the resolution was printed on January 15, 1939, and has not even yet been made available to members of this House. That report discusses in 47 pages all of the outstanding court decisions. It comments upon the report submitted to this House by the Department of Justice at the request of the Treasury Department and taking issue with opinion of the Justice Department, the experts say as follows:

It appears that the only way all of the salaries of State and political subdivision officers and employees could be reached by the Federal Government and all the salaries of Federal officers and employees could be reached by the State governments is by a constitutional amendment.

Now, we have charged in this resolution, as a basis for determining this to be a matter of privilege of the House, first, that this report was sequestered, that it was concealed from the Members, and, although it was printed, you understand, on January 15, 1939, it has not even yet been made available for general distribution to Members of the House or to all the members of the Ways and Means Committee. It exists, however. I have a copy of it, and it is the product and the work of a standing committee of this House. We further say that the ignoring, the neglecting, or sequestering of this report impaired the ability of the Members of the House of Representatives to fulfill their oaths of office and uphold and defend the Constitution by due means and study the legislation which they might believe to be in violation of the Constitution.

If there were reports or information in a congressional committee set up for this purpose which were withheld from the Congress, then that is a matter affecting at least the efficiency of this Congress and the integrity of this Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know that I may yield while discussing a point of order, but if I can I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I was just going to say that these experts of the Joint Committee on Taxation were investigating the precise point involved, the constitutionality of this act, and they made a definite report on that, all based upon the recommendation in the President's message.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I understand it, the joint committee which we set up and the experts who were working on this in the Department of Justice were coexistent and were covering exactly the same questions.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will be very pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not also true that the self-constituted committee from the Attorney General's office and also the Treasury, were permitted to present a large and voluminous report to the Ways and Means Committee

setting forth their side of the contention, when it was well known by some at least that this report of a committee lawfully set up by this Congress was not permitted to be introduced before the Ways and Means Committee or before the Congress?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is one of the pertinent reasons, I think for contending there has been a violation of the integrity of the Congress.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Does the gentleman contend that the Joint Committee on Taxation had approved this report made by the so-called experts?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I have definitely set out in my resolution that it has not, and that it is not the work of the committee but the work of the experts who were employed by the committee under the direction of Congress to make this study; but the charge is that somehow or other these findings of the experts who have been on the pay roll, some of them since 1926, of this joint committee, have been pigeonholed and were not available to the Members of the Congress.

This instrumentality set up as an agency of the legislative branch of the Government has been quashed. The report of the Department of Justice has been published in full and made available to the Members and has been published in synopsis form and made available to the Members through the medium of the report of the Ways and Means Committee, but there is no mention whatsoever in the report of the Ways and Means Committee or in any other document before the Members of the House of this report made by our own committee, although the Public Printer advises that the report was printed and delivered on January 15, 11 days before the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee started and 25 days before the consideration of this bill in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman answer one further question? Does the gentleman know whether or not the joint committee itself ever considered this report?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I do not; but I do know—and this would be brought out if we were given an opportunity to discuss the question of how this report happened to come to life—I do know, or we have reason to assume, because of the facts and circumstances surrounding the release of this report, that certain members of the joint committee did have it in their possession, substantiating the assertions of the Public Printer that this printed report was delivered to the joint committee or some member thereof.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Knowing the gentleman as I do, I know the gentleman would not directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, inferentially or by innuendo, want to convey to any Member of this House or certainly to have the press convey it to the American people, if it were not so, that a report was withheld from the consideration of the Members of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman right now that I have been very careful not to charge any Member of this body, or any Member of the other body, with willfully and maliciously concealing this report, but I do say that it has been withheld.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a pretty serious statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course it is, and I realize its seriousness. That is why I am choosing my words as I go along.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman permit me to give him a little bit of evidence. I came in while the gentleman was talking and made inquiries and found out what the gentleman was talking about, that he was making rather serious charges. For the benefit of the gentleman and for the benefit of the Members of the House, it happens that I have in my pocket a letter which I found on my desk yesterday morning. It arrived in my office yesterday morning. I put it in my pocket and took it to my hotel last night to

read it, but circumstances were such that I did not have time to read it last night. I again put it in my pocket to read at the earliest possible moment. The letter is dated February 10, 1939, and is addressed to me as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The bill my friend refers to was considered last week. I am glad to read this letter so that there will be no misunderstanding, and nothing more said about secrecy. There is too much innuendo about secrecy lately. The letter reads, in part, as follows:

There is transmitted herewith a report entitled "Power of Congress to tax the interest from State and local securities and the compensation of State and local employees," prepared by the staff of the committee. The report deals with the question in what are considered by the staff to be its principal aspects, namely, whether the Congress has the power directly to tax the subject interest or compensation, whether it may do so indirectly and whether the reciprocal or mutual taxation plan proposed would prove effective. As indicated on the cover of the report, it has not yet been considered or approved by the joint committee or any member thereof.

I think that evidence should certainly remove from the mind of the distinguished gentleman, and if not from the gentleman's mind then from the mind of any other gentleman, the thought that any member of the Ways and Means Committee or joint committee had knowledge of this, and that there has been any withholding of any information. The first intimation I had was yesterday, and I have stated the facts in chronological order. The letter is dated February 10 and was received yesterday in my office. I put it in my pocket the same as we all do, to take to our homes or hotels to read last night. I have not had the opportunity of reading it, but there certainly has been no withholding. With this evidence the gentleman ought to accept as conclusive that the inferences which he has made, with his lack of evidence, are absolutely incorrect.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am glad the gentleman made those observations. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that he has been but recently appointed a member of this committee, I understand within the past 2 weeks, otherwise he might have received a copy of this report at an earlier date. I am convinced other members of the committee received copies previous to yesterday. If the gentleman will bear with me, and will not be humiliated by the information, I call his attention to the fact that although the gentleman was not given a copy of this report until yesterday, the press commented on the fact on February 10 in this manner:

While the House was debating the salary tax bill, members of a Senate subcommittee—which has been holding hearings on another Presidential recommendation that income from all Government securities be made taxable—were considering a confidential report from the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue.

I hope that information will not humiliate the gentleman. I hope he will not be humiliated by realizing that although he is a member of this committee, he was not given a copy of this report when the press was given a copy of the report the day after the House voted on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is clearly of opinion that although this conversation may be very illuminating, it does not bear directly upon the question that the Chair has to decide, and the Chair would be pleased if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] would conclude his argument on the point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the Chair wishes me to decline to yield further, I shall be very glad not to do so.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Mississippi to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not yield to the gentleman to make a point of order while another point of order is being considered. A point of order cannot lie when another point of order is pending.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter in the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the point of order that taking as correct every statement made by the gentleman from Michigan, it does not constitute basis for rising to a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would like to be heard on that. In that respect I have not finished my perhaps rather weak argument.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We also allege in the resolution that this action in ignoring, neglecting, or sequestering pertinent and important information bearing upon the constitutionality of legislation did adversely affect the safety, dignity, and integrity of the proceedings of the House of Representatives and the Members thereof. We also state in the resolution that the ignoring, neglecting, or sequestration of this report has had the effect of concealment, to deceive and mislead, and to cause the Members to vote with a lack of adequate available information on an important tax measure of questionable constitutionality.

My point in that particular is that if there was any intention, either implied or otherwise, to mislead this House, to deceive this House, to withhold valuable information which any Member of this House or any committee thereof knew to be in existence, then it is surely a matter of high privilege for this House, and should be considered on the floor hereof.

We also set forth that this concealing, neglecting, and ignoring of the report of a standing committee of the Congress, pertinent to pending legislation, if deliberate, is utterly indefensible and in violation of the constitutional procedure in the Congress; and the debates on this matter will bear out at least the conclusion which many have come to—that the withholding of this report has been deliberate and for a deliberate purpose.

We set forth that the belated knowledge of this report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has placed many of the Members of the House of Representatives in an embarrassing and humiliating position, and any act on the part of any individual—perhaps that is not true—but any act on the part of the Members or any important group of people or the press which has the public ear, which reflects upon the dignity of this House to the humiliation of the Members of this House, is plainly a matter of high privilege of this House and should be considered as such, and especially should this be true of such reflections resulting from the acts or omissions of anyone or of an agency directly connected with this House.

We also charge that the ignoring, neglecting, or concealing of the aforementioned report constitutes a denial to the Members of the House of Representatives of their official rights and privileges, and it affects the privileges of this House in that it was denied the privilege and the right to have before it, when this legislation was considered, this all-important report of a committee which was set up by its own action to study this question and report to it in anticipation of the consideration of such legislation, such as H. R. 3790.

I submit that the allegations of this resolution present a question involving the safety, dignity, and integrity of the proceedings of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] raises in a new form the original question of privilege submitted for the determination of the Chair. The resolution now pending provides—

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the acts and omissions herein charged constitute a question of privileges affecting the safety, dignity, and integrity of the proceedings of this House of Representatives.

The Chair, in its former decision, announced the general principle of parliamentary law that should govern this question; but in addition to the statements there made in connection with this resolution and the admissions that have been made upon the floor, the only matter now apparent in the RECORD about which the gentleman from Michigan can com-

plain is that a staff of experts employed by the joint committee made certain suggestions with reference to the legal aspects of proposed legislation. It is admitted that the committee itself never took any action upon those suggestions, and, for aught appearing in this RECORD, the committee might have entirely differed from the legal conclusion submitted by the staff of experts.

In addition to that, the mere fact that a committee of the House fails to make available to the membership of the House the hearings or the opinions of persons appearing before such committee does not give a Member the right to raise the question of privilege of the House, when such privilege is based solely upon that ground. As a matter of fact, a great many proceedings before committees of the House are not submitted to the House or to the Members. A great many meetings of committees are in executive session. A great mass of evidence appearing before a committee that might be valuable to Members of the House in drawing conclusions on legislation is never, as a matter of fact, presented to the House or to the membership.

For those reasons the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] that the facts asserted in the preamble to this resolution do not constitute a matter affecting the safety, dignity, and integrity of the proceedings of the House of Representatives.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the majority leader a little while ago say something about no one being allowed to speak?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; because of the desire to consider the national defense bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly if my friend from Massachusetts takes his position as a result of something the majority leader said, under no conditions would I embarrass my distinguished friend from Texas by submitting a request. I therefore withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

#### APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 4, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Government Organization the following Members of the House to fill the existing vacancies thereon: Mr. COX, of Georgia; Mr. SCHULTE, of Indiana; Mr. DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 60, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on Government Organization, the following Members of the House to fill the existing vacancies thereon: Mr. COX, of Georgia; Mr. SCHULTE, of Indiana; Mr. DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

#### NATIONAL-DEFENSE BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 88.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 88

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3791, a bill to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Michigan desire any time on the resolution?

Mr. MAPES. I would like 3 or 4 minutes only.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising is to have carried in the RECORD the fact that the statements made by my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WORCOTT] about the membership of the House being misled or deceived are without foundation. Statements of this kind are rather strong statements to make. I also realize that what I might say is not of a sensational nature. If I attack you, or if I attack this House, or if I attack any committee of this House, that is news; but any Member who rises in defense, or who undertakes to present what are the true facts, does not state anything which constitutes news. I do not want, by this statement, to have anyone draw the inference that I think my distinguished friend from Michigan was seeking news. I admire him and I respect him, but, being a member of the joint committee and listening to his statements in support of his resolution, I cannot, in all justice to the members of the Ways and Means Committee and to this House, permit any impression to exist that any information of value to any Member of the House was withheld. I stated what I had when I recited the information I now hold in my hand.

The Ways and Means Committee never, as a committee, had this information; and if the Ways and Means Committee did, I am frank in stating that I doubt if it would have changed the action which was taken. The fact remains, however, that the Ways and Means Committee never had this document, and I submit that it is not fair to rise in the House and make statements which convey the impression to the membership of this House and to the country at large that actions are being engaged in or have been engaged in that are of a questionable nature. Such statements, Mr. Speaker, go deeper than this middle aisle which separates the Members of the Democratic and Republican Parties. Such statements, carried to the country, constitute a direct attack upon representative government.

In the heat of debate we may all of us say things that upon reflection we regret, but certainly in the heat of debate none of us would deliberately ever make a statement which would impugn in the minds of the public the integrity of this great body. When the integrity of any committee of this body is attacked or impugned without incontrovertible evidence to support it, that attempt reflects itself upon this distinguished body.

I am proud of my membership in this body. I am proud of my associations with all of my colleagues without regard to party, and I dislike, when I sit in this body, particularly when I am conversant with the situation, to see an honest but completely incorrect impression conveyed to my colleagues, and—of more far-reaching importance—conveyed to the people at large, that a great committee of this House had deliberately withheld certain evidence.

I hope that I have satisfied the minds of the membership of this House. I hope that the press—not because I am making this statement, but because the integrity of the House itself is involved—will see that both sides are presented to the American people and that the report complained of was a report never given to the Committee on Ways and Means. So far as I, a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, am concerned, the first time I knew of this report was yesterday. I can understand how the press might have gotten it on February 10, for a special Senate committee has been holding hearings on this subject. The attorneys general of the various States and other public officials were down here last week and appeared before that special committee, and I can very easily see where this information may have been transmitted to the members of the Senate committee—not members of the Joint Committee on Taxation but members of a special Senate committee—and I can very easily see why that should be done, because it was on February 10, according to the gentleman from Michigan, and it was the same day this report was mailed to me.

I hope that similar incidents of this kind, where the integrity of the House is attacked or impugned, will happen with more infrequency in the future. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having been satisfied that the charges made by the gentleman from Michigan were unfounded, unjustifiable, and unwarranted, I yielded to my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts to disprove these unfair and baseless charges. I greatly deplore that the gentleman from Michigan should have been used for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution makes in order H. R. 5791, the national-defense bill recommended by the President and unanimously reported—except for minor reservations—by the Military Affairs Committee.

The rule provides for 6 hours' general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, after which the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion the Committee shall report same to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Consequently, the usual charge coming from the other side that no opportunity has been given for debate and that it is a gag rule surely cannot be made against this rule.

I do not desire to take up the time of this House by reviewing the bill. The gentleman from Kentucky will go into that thoroughly. All I want to mention is that it provides for 3,032 additional planes, the elimination of obsolete equipment, and for raising our number of first-line planes to 5,500 within 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have always stood as an opponent of militarism and against appropriations for maintaining an unnecessarily huge military force.

I am urging the adoption of this resolution because, while our traditional policy has been and is to foster friendly relations with all nations and to threaten no nation, we must forever guard against power-maddened aggressors.

In pointing out the need for national defense, the President stated, in his message of January 12, that this—

Does not remotely indicate that the Congress or the President have any thought of taking part in another war on European soil, but it does show that in 1917 we were not ready to conduct large-scale land or air operations. Relatively we are not much more ready to do so today than we were then—and we cannot guarantee a long period free from attack in which we could prepare.

Secretary Hull, a peace-loving man, after a sane consideration of conditions, declares, "The specter of a new major armed conflict haunts the world."

This House does not need to be reminded that a future war will come without warning. A formal declaration of war, if made at all, will reach us no sooner than the drone of enemy planes. There will be no time then to forge our defenses. Now is the time to prepare. President Roosevelt points out that "there is a new range and speed to offense."

Increasingly that range and speed grows greater, and we must face all eventualities. Oceans now spanned by air-planes bring Europe closer to us each day. We cannot afford to be unprotected, nor placed in a position where we must yield to foreign terror.

I believe, and have always believed, that differences between nations should be settled by peaceful methods, but, as Secretary Hull emphasized, it takes two to reach an agreement.

With totalitarian nations hungry for conquest—with dictators whose power over their people can only be maintained by agitation and aggression to take the minds of the people off of the economic ruin into which they have been plunged, with these nations unwilling to employ peaceful mediation—there is no alternative but that we face them secure in a strong defense.

We must guard against the dangerous propaganda that streams from the dictators, echoed here by those who seek to misinterpret our program of national defense and degrade it into a political issue. This is no time for petty issues.

Let us place national safety above party politics and work in harmony. We arm not for conquest but to defend more than our lives. We arm to protect all that we hold sacred—religious freedom, the rights of the individual, everything that we know as free government. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, everyone, as far as I know, favors this resolution. I shall take only a moment to call attention to the novel title of the bill which the resolution seeks to make in order. As far as my recollection goes, confirmed by some investigation, this is the first time that the title of a bill has referred to any recommendation of the Chief Executive. The title of the bill is as follows:

"A bill to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress."

I find no reference to the recommendations of the President or to his message of January 12, 1939, in the body of the bill. It seems to me that it is entirely out of place to refer to it in the title. To do so is out of harmony with the dignity of a coordinate branch of the Government. If the legislation is good the Congress is entitled to take the credit for it. If it is bad, it should and must assume the responsibility for it.

Judging from the expressions on the faces of the chairman and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs, I assume at the proper time a request will be made to amend the title.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Does not the gentleman recognize the fact that the President of the United States has the right to recommend to this Congress and this Congress has the right, if it sees fit, to follow the recommendations of the President?

Mr. MAPES. Oh, yes; it is the duty of the President to recommend legislation, but the responsibility for the passage of legislation rests upon the Congress, and I do not like to see a coordinate branch of the Government, like the Congress, hide behind the skirts of the President in the passage of legislation. This is the first time in my experience that any such thing as this has ever been attempted. If this reference to the message of the President remains in the title, what will be its effect, if any? If anyone wants to find out what the law is, will he have to refer to the message of the President as well as to the act itself to ascertain? What bearing has the reference in the title to the message of the President? Is it going to affect any court or administrative officer in the interpretation of the law? At best it is only surplusage; it has no place in the title or in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this opportunity to state that I expect to support the pending bill. The probabilities are I will not be here tomorrow when the vote is taken, for the reason that I may be required to be absent on important official business. For this reason I take this time to state my position.

I have always been in favor of adequate national defense, and I am in favor of the general principles contained in this bill, and I should vote for it if I were present. When the House comes to the consideration of this bill, amendments will no doubt be offered to provide for the number of airplanes to be constructed in given periods of time. Great care should be taken with reference to providing for the construction of airplanes and all other instrumentalities of national defense. We must recognize the fact that obsolescence is a law of nature and the law of nature moves very rapidly sometimes and always moves with great certainty. In all these intricate and modern equipments great care should be exercised against changes and improvements. For this reason, if an amendment shall be offered that would stagger production of airplanes so as to produce them on a schedule I should support it. I am in favor of defending my country and providing adequately to be in position to

do it. Still I am opposed to mixing in foreign entanglements. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] desire to use any more time?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, we have no more requests for time on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### RESIGNATION FROM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 14, 1939.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*

*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the General Anthony Wayne Memorial Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

#### GEN. ANTHONY WAYNE MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 64, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Gen. Anthony Wayne Memorial Commission the following Members of the House to fill the existing vacancies thereon: MESSRS. CROWE, of Indiana; HARTER, of Ohio; and CLEVINGER, of Ohio.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3791, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the lamp of life flickered and went out, and the notable Pope Pius XI passed away. His immortal spirit crossed the dark corridor into the land from which no traveler returns. As he went, with his last utterance he left with us this most remarkable message: "We have much to do. Peace to the world."

Today, in that spirit, I bring to the House of Representatives this measure, which is a peace measure, not a war measure. [Applause.]

Something has been said here about the unusual features of this proposed legislation. There is nothing unusual about it except that it is both a defense measure and a recovery measure.

In presenting the bill to the House of Representatives, I, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, feel it incumbent upon me and my duty to say that the bill is the result of many weeks of extended hearings and very careful study by all the members of the committee. Also I am very happy to accord to the minority members of our committee due credit for the part they have played in the preparation of this measure. They have been considerate at all times of the chairman and the other members of the committee. They have not in any sense attempted to obstruct but, on the contrary, have been patriotic, courageous, and impartial, just as have we of the majority. With this feeling toward the entire committee, I wish to say we are here to render the very best possible service to our country. We have no axes to grind,

no criticism to make, and no charges to prefer against anyone. Nor is there now or has there been at any time any intimation whatsoever of partisanship or political rancor.

In presenting this measure I wish to say to the Members of the House that in an effort to see that everyone who will be called upon to vote upon the measure has an opportunity to study the hearings and inform himself, I directed the clerk of the committee to place in the seat of each Member of the House for distribution yesterday morning copies of the hearings, and they are available now on the floor of the House. In the report we have attempted to give a brief analysis of each of the sections of the measure for the information of the Members, so that by a mere reading of the report they may be able to grasp the purport, tenor, and effect of the proposed legislation.

I believe I am safe in saying there is no issue over the measure with the exception of one section, and that is section 1, relating to the number of airplanes to be provided for the Air Corps. As I understand, there is a very slight issue over that section, and only on the question of whether or not the production of these planes should be staggered over a particular number of years or with a particular number of planes for each year, or whether it shall be left to the discretion of the War Department to proceed under their regular plans.

For the purpose of explaining the first section, which, as I say, presents practically the only issue, I should like to state that this section authorizes the Secretary of War to equip and maintain the Air Corps with not to exceed 5,500 airplanes. Authorization of this number of planes is essential to carry out the program of the War Department prepared in accordance with the figures recommended by the President for the augmentation of our existing air defenses. The program provides for the procurement of approximately 3,032 planes in addition to those on hand or on order. This increase in the number of planes will raise the total in 1941 to approximately 5,500, of which number it is contemplated that about 2,100 will be held in reserve, without personnel. Of these planes in reserve, more than 1,300 will be of the combat type, and 820 will be training planes and in constant use. This leaves 1,280 planes actually in reserve. They will constitute the source of recruit for planes disabled or destroyed in combat.

The wisdom of keeping a reserve of planes under this section of the bill is perfectly apparent, although I take it this question will be the point of argument and the bone of contention in the debate. All the major powers in the world have an adequate reserve of planes for the reason that if we got into combat in the air, and if we had only the number of planes for which we had flying pilots and planes were shot down, we would perhaps have pilots without planes to operate and we would have no planes to fill the places of the planes that were lost or disabled. From the experience of all the governments of the world and of the War Department it is believed that we will always have more pilots than we have planes, because the pilot sometimes escapes catastrophe by using his parachute and can get out of the plane and come to the ground in safety, but if a plane falls, it is crashed and ruined and is unserviceable at least for the hours of the combat.

In connection with this feature of the program, which is to provide 5,500 airplanes for the Air Corps, I believe it would be well to give you some statistics with regard to the air power of the major nations of the world, so you can see the apparent necessity for this expansion. For instance, let us consider the British Empire, with a population of 448,385,000 people. In the entire Empire they have a regular army of 1,107,570 men. They have an active air force of 87,950, with 26,175 in reserve, or a total of approximately 114,000. The British Isles, with a population of 47,600,000 people, has an army of 573,000 and an air corps of 83,000, with an air reserve of 25,000, or 108,000 men.

China, with a population of 486,000,000, has an army of 2,000,000 men, with 7,500 active air officers and no reserve, a total of 7,500. This is a sufficient explanation of why the

Chinese are being bombed from the air with impunity today. France, with a population of 42,757,785, has an army of 725,759 and a reserve of 5,300,000 men, making a total of 6,025,000. France is a small state, with one-third the population of our country, and not comparable in any sense with the wealth of the United States. In addition to this, France has an active air corps of 64,650 men, with 6,220 in reserve, or a total of 70,870.

Germany, with a population of 77,000,000, has an army of 3,900,000 and, according to the best figures we can get, she has 206,000 in the active air corps and 20,000 reserves, making a total of 226,000.

Italy, with 44,556,968, has an army of 7,412,168, an air corps of 103,555, with 331,428 reserves, or a total of 434,993 in the air corps.

Japan, with 72,052,800 population, has an army of 6,248,000, an air corps of 21,500, a reserve of 26,100, or a total of 47,600.

Russia has a population of 170,000,000, 18,000,000 in her army, 80,000 in her air corps, and no reserves.

As against all this the United States has today a population of 130,714,953, with an Army of 183,447, with a National Guard of 210,484, or a total of 393,931; an active Air Corps of 20,341, a reserve of 5,544, or a pitiable showing of 25,895.

I present these figures for the consideration of the membership to emphasize the necessity for this expansion of the Air Corps.

Now, in connection with the remaining sections of the bill I should like to call your attention to the report and invite you to read it, because it gives you an analysis of the bill, as we understand it and as it is understood by the War Department.

Someone has asked us, and you often hear the question propounded, why all this preparation for war; why this expansion of the armed forces of the United States? Well, it is perfectly apparent to everyone of us that we have the most priceless heritage to protect. This Nation was the result of a revolution for liberty and man's inalienable right to be free and oftentimes you will hear some one remark, "Well, what is the danger of invasion by a foreign foe?" Frankly, I would say that at this time there possibly is no particular danger, but developments throughout the world are convincing to the effect that the time is not far distant when such a thing is possible. I would answer that by saying that if we should continue to sleep and to procrastinate in the matter of putting our own house in order, we might be caught napping at some time when it was least expected. No nation in the world is going to give us a year's written notice or even a 60-day notice of their intention to attack us.

Today we know there are only two democracies left in Europe. Today we know there is a conflict on throughout the world between autocracy or dictatorship on the one hand and democracy on the other, and if ever the time should come that these two democracies should fall, then they would undoubtedly fall to the dictatorships, and if they did, then the mobilization of the navies of the world and the mobilization of the armed forces of the world, as I have detailed them to you here from only five of the great nations of the earth, would probably be able to establish, by some kind of trade agreement or treaty obligation, or some other method, air bases in the Western Hemisphere, and in order to protect ourselves against that kind of eventuality we are providing for an armed force for protective purposes only. I may say to my colleagues there is no aggression in this program and no desire upon the part of anybody connected with our Military Establishment or on your Military Affairs Committee to provide for any aggression upon any neighbor. But we are determined that with the help of God and the power of the American people no other Nation shall transgress our liberty.

May I now call attention to the fact that when we talk about defense of our country we ought to think about the things that we are to defend. First of all, we are to defend one of the few countries upon the face of the earth in which it is yet possible for men to enjoy the precious privileges of freedom of religion, freedom of worship, freedom of speech,

and freedom of the press. This is the first great heritage that this program proposes to protect.

It then will be able also to protect life and property of our citizens, and when I refer to property associated with life and liberty, I am just one of the old-fashioned fellows who actually believes that neither life nor property would be worth much in this country unless we had liberty to enjoy it, and I am sure that neither life nor liberty would be worth very much if we did not have property or the privilege of acquiring property with which we could enjoy that.

Now, let us see where we are. It is a well-known fact that America has the longest seaboard and the most extensive coast of any country in the world. We have it on the east and on the west, and then we have our outlying possessions in the oceans. We have Panama, miles away from the homeland, and undoubtedly nobody upon the floor of the House, or nobody in any other body connected with the Congress will contend that it is not the duty of the American Government to still contend for and protect the principles embodied in the Monroe Doctrine, which means the protection of the Western Hemisphere from infiltration into our citizenship and our theories of government of foreign, militaristic notions that will ultimately destroy the liberties of the common masses of our people.

With this idea in mind, we have brought you this program that brings our Regular Army up to approximately 190,000 and our National Guard to 210,000 as the initial protective force in our Military Establishment approximating 400,000 men in all.

That is a small army as compared with the figures of the armies I have just read to you, and the armies maintained by many governments that are less capable and able to maintain them than we; but, having pursued for 150 years the policy of peace with all nations and entangling alliances with none, and having pursued that kindred policy of maintaining only a small standing army in order to avoid the expense of a large standing army, it is perfectly proper and right that we should bring you a measure providing only for the necessary and adequate defense of our own homeland and our outlying possessions.

With that idea in mind, I call attention to the fact that according to the best figures that we are able to obtain—and these are not accurate by any means, particularly as to one country—Germany today has 9,800 planes; Great Britain, 7,100 planes; Russia, 5,550; Italy, 4,000; the United States, 3,500 planes. Therefore we are in the fifth place in the list of nations that claim to have air power.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky a question. How many people in Germany are engaged in the manufacture of aircraft at this time, and how many are engaged in that pursuit in the United States?

Mr. MAY. We do not have the figures, or at least I do not, as to the number of people Germany employs.

Mr. HOUSTON. I understand it is around 165,000, and about 30,000 in this country. Are those figures approximately correct?

Mr. MAY. I am not certain, but I think they are near it. I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] has those figures.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes. I believe the gentleman from Ohio can probably answer that question, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. I believe I can answer that. The best information that we have from the source of the industry itself indicates that there are 200,000 engaged in the production of aircraft in Germany, as against 27,000 in the United States.

Mr. HOUSTON. What is the potential production of aircraft in Germany, comparable to the production in the United States?

Mr. MAY. The present production of aircraft in Germany, as we understand it, is 1,200 per month, and in this country it is probably 10 or 15 per month, or perhaps 30, of the flying fortress type, and of all types and kinds around 200 per month.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. First let me proceed with this a little further. In connection with this program I call attention to the fact that not long ago there was published in the United States News what is known as the new aviation map by hours, which shows the possibility of bombing the cities of this country by foreign air fleets.

According to that map it is exactly 12¼ hours from Oslo to New York City by air; it is 13¼ hours from Berlin to New York; it is 11½ hours from London to New York; it is 12 hours from Paris to Washington; it is 14¼ hours from Rome to Washington; and it is 13¼ hours from Gibraltar to Washington; and from the Azores to Washington, 8¾ hours. So that in these changing times of speed and air flight we are not at all immune from attack, and if the unfortunate situation should ever arise that the democracies of Europe that still stand should fall, and it then is possible to mobilize the navies of the European countries at present with airplane carriers, even without an air base on the Western Hemisphere, it might be possible and it is entirely probable that they would be able to marshal an air force and airplane carriers within such distance of our shores as would enable them to inflict great damage to our great cities.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has just called attention to the short number of hours in making a trip to the United States from some other countries. Would we not have to take into consideration the fact that these bombers, or whatever they may be, would have to make the return trip?

Mr. MAY. They would either have to return or never go back. That is what we are preparing for, to see to it that they do not go back.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So that in calculating the number of hours we must take that into consideration?

Mr. MAY. Yes. And also take into consideration the weight of their load, but if anyone ever undertakes to bomb New York City with its \$65,000,000,000 of wealth, as the great financial and commercial center of the country, we do not expect to let them in long enough to drop their loads, and especially if they do come in and drop anything, we will see to it that they do not get back.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman is making, and this thought occurs to me: What is the significance of a comparison of the air power, say, of Germany and other nations that are lying close together, like Germany and Italy and France, and the air power of the United States? It seems to me that there is really no significance in comparing those countries and their air power with our own, because those contentious countries are lying as neighbors, whereas we are at a distance of 3,000 miles removed from any of these countries that might have designs upon us. Moreover, let us assume some airplane comes across from some nation that has it in for us for some purpose. How are we going to be able to tell from the approach of that plane whether it is an enemy or friendly plane until really after the damage is done through this suicidal trip, because that is what it would amount to?

Mr. MAY. We will be able to ascertain the direction from which it comes, and we have detectors now in our Coast Guard and in the Navy and in the Army. The purpose of this bill is not merely to strengthen the Air Corps alone, but it takes care of coast defenses, provides housing for the Panama Canal, and additional personnel of about 20,000 for the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I would like to emphasize the question which the gentleman has propounded by making this statement: That under the well-recognized law of self-defense if an antagonist is located in a position of protection and he has a second base to come to and a third base, until he can get closer and closer to the person or nation he is attacking, would not the person being attacked be justified in taking action when he left the first base and before he got to the second, or at the second and before he got to the third, and thus ward off danger. In line with that idea, England, of course, is within 2 hours of the air bases of Germany. Its whole industrial, economic, and financial life is bound up in an area in the city of London, measured by the radius of a circle 25 miles in length. Its shipyards, its ship landings, its commerce, its power stations, its railroads, and every source of activity in the British Isles, might be blown off the map overnight if they were not provided with a comparable fleet to make proper defense. If that happened, then they might mobilize the fleets of England and other countries and attack us. We are certainly within our own rights to give aid, by all lawful and peaceable means, to other democracies which may become our shock absorbers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has emphasized just the reason I stated, that a comparison of the air power of Germany and England with the air power of this country is really of no consequence, because they lie so close to each other, whereas we are so far removed.

Mr. MAY. It only emphasizes the possibility of taking away from us our last line of defense; and, in all probability, a vital one.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I ask the gentleman one other question, because I am intensely interested in this matter?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to have the gentleman give the House the benefit of his views as to just how far this defense program is going to carry us; just what it means. In other words, how far are we going to defend ourselves?

Mr. MAY. We are going only as far as is necessary to defend the Western Hemisphere and our outlying possessions, particularly the Panama Canal Zone. That is the life line between this country and any attacking foe from any other quarter. We provide adequately for that; but no man can foresee just where the conflict, if one should come, may be.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In other words, we have no design to go beyond taking care of the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. MAY. I have made that statement previously, and I repeat it, that this is not a program of aggression but a program of self-preservation. But, finally, let me say that the sooner we let the world understand that we not only want and will strive for "peace with honor" but that we are neither cowards nor afraid to die if need be for the preservation of the honor and dignity of our country. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, national defense is in no sense a partisan issue; but it is a large concern of national policy which touches directly the welfare, prosperity, and security of every home in the land. In this respect of the discussion, the Republican members of the Committee recognize a great responsibility to the American people to the end that we shall exert every proper influence on the side of orderly and deliberative legislative procedure.

In an extended executive session on January 20 the members of the minority surveyed the whole field of foreign relations and defense, and agreed upon three principal concerns of Republican legislative policy, as follows:

First, to invite a clear definition of the fixed foreign policy of the United States, as a measuring rod for the whole scheme of defense;

Second, to insure a sound integration of the land, naval, air and industrial segments of the defense program in the interest of maximum efficiency and economy; and

Third, to make certain that the projected rearmament program shall be directed exclusively to the defense and

security of the Nation, rather than toward dangerous intervention in the international frictions and discords of other peoples.

With this in mind, the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] appointed a committee on our side to study this important question, with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] as its chairman. Before going into details of this measure I now yield, out of my own time, to the gentleman from New York for such statement he may wish to make at this time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy extended to me by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and I shall endeavor to restrain my loquacity to such an extent that it shall not keep the Committee of the Whole too long.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] has stated that at a meeting of the Republican Members of the House held on last Thursday an agreement was reached with respect to a statement concerning the national defense. At the risk of repetition, at least so far as many Republicans now on the floor are concerned, and solely with the purpose of bringing to Members on the Democratic side of the aisle this expression of opinion from the minority, I beg leave to consume about 6 minutes in reading that statement.

Before I do so, I think I can say that you will find no evidence of partisanship in it. Furthermore, you will find no note of belligerency contained in it. We were not concerned with parties or their fortunes, nor were we concerned with any foreign nation in its relation to ourselves at this moment.

The statement is as follows:

In the foreign policy of the United States, which has been consistent and has developed naturally with the years, there has been for over a century but one principle which has remained definite and unchanged—the principle known as the Monroe Doctrine. The famous declaration of President Monroe informed the nations of Europe that the United States would regard any attempt to extend European domination in the countries of Central and South America as an unfriendly act. It is not a treaty, nor has any foreign power ever approved it. It is, in truth, a "no trespass" sign posted around the entire area south of the Rio Grande, and as the years have passed we have made it plain that the warning is addressed to all foreign powers, no matter where situated.

While the doctrine may be of advantage to the nations of Latin America, fundamentally it is our doctrine and ours alone. We adhere to it because we are convinced that our safety is dependent upon its enforcement. It is a policy of defense.

The United States may from time to time adopt new attitudes and pursue new policies relating to other matters in this ever-changing world, but there can be no lessening of its devotion to the Monroe Doctrine because this, more than any other single aspect of policy, involves the safety of the Nation and its vital interests. Especially is this true now that, by an act of Congress we are withdrawing from the Philippines and shall not be expected to defend those islands.

Obviously, our Military Establishment must be adequate to carry out the obligation so clearly implied in the Monroe Doctrine—the obligation to prevent the extension of foreign political domination through military action in the Western Hemisphere. This may well be considered as part of the supreme obligation to defend the continental United States. We thus envision our whole defense. Without the Panama Canal we should be sadly handicapped. It is our life line and must be maintained.

For our defense in the Pacific we believe the mission of our Military Establishment is the maintenance, impregnably, of the line following roughly the one hundred and eightieth meridian, commencing at the Alaskan Islands, passing somewhat westward of Hawaii, and thence generally southeastward to include and cover the Panama Canal. With comparatively slight additions our presently authorized military strength, both Army and Navy, is equal to that particular task.

We conceive the disposition of our military forces in the Atlantic and the Pacific as having a common objective—the enforcement of our defense policy. We should look upon Oahu as an outpost not only of our Pacific coast, but of the Canal. We should look upon Guantanamo and Puerto Rico and our naval and aviation establishments along our Atlantic coast as likewise outposts of Panama. Everything should be done to extend and strengthen such outposts in the areas of defense, whether they be in the hands of the Army or the Navy.

As for Panama itself, there is great need of a substantial increase in the strength of the garrison, in order that the armament now there or shortly to be installed may be manned with at least one shift; and we must add certain equipment vital to the conduct of its defense.

If we control the sea and the air over a wide radius from the Canal it will not be easy for an enemy to reach it from the sea. Likewise, if when the need arises, we take instant measures to prevent the establishment of hostile bases in Central or South America, we shall have gone a long way toward closing the door.

With our defense system made effective far out in the Pacific and far out in the Atlantic, with hostile military infiltration promptly prevented, and with the Canal itself fortified to the utmost degree of effectiveness, we shall be secure in the Western World. Such should be our military policy; such must be our defense.

Proceeding to a discussion of certain provisions set forth in pending legislation having to do with the strengthening of our defenses, we make certain recommendations.

We believe that the item of appropriation which, if adopted, would go far toward perfecting our Panama defenses is sound.

Likewise, the item providing for the placing of educational orders by the War Department is equally sound. In fact we believe that a state of reasonable industrial preparedness while not as dramatic, is fully as important as preparedness in the purely military sense.

Again we find ourselves in agreement with proposals contained in pending legislation looking toward the addition and strengthening of naval aviation and submarine bases in the Atlantic, as well as the addition of similar bases in the vast Pacific area bounded roughly on the west by the one hundred and eightieth meridian.

We entertain serious doubts as to the necessity or wisdom of extending our line of defense as far to the westward as the Island of Guam.

Coming to a consideration of our air forces, we believe that our vital interests demand the procurement of additional planes for the Army which, when added to useful planes now on hand and to planes now in course of manufacture, shall bring the total to a maximum authorized strength of 5,500—all obsolete planes being eliminated.

We suggest, however, that instead of acquiring additional planes in substantially a single increment, it would be wise to manage our production so that our maximum authorized strength will be reached by annual increments over a period of 3 or 4 years.

By such a program the problem of training new pilots and the organization of new tactical units in the Army Air Corps would be greatly simplified, and, further, the ever present problem of obsolescence in the planes themselves could be met from year to year without impairing the fighting strength of the Air Corps, as might be the case if obsolescence of a large proportion of our planes should overtake us at recurring intervals.

By thus spreading the effort the financial strain to be reflected in the budgets of 1940 and 1941 will be lessened.

In any event, with an Army Air Corps at a maximum strength of 5,500, with additional Army personnel trained for its operation, coupled with a naval air force approximating 3,000 planes—

And I interpolate here: That is the number now authorized—

we believe the air defense of our country will be adequate.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the statement agreed upon by the members of the minority on last Thursday afternoon. I am not sure that it is expected of me at this time to continue very far with this discussion of national defense. Perhaps I will be allowed to make some observations and suggestions concerning the Air Corps and the function of aviation generally in warfare.

As has been suggested by questions propounded by the gentleman from Montana, I think we should approach the solution of our problem of defense in the air in a somewhat different way than it is approached in Europe. Every great industrial center in Europe, and every great political capital in Europe is today subject potentially to mass bombing. The air force of any one of those countries can, upon a moment's notice, deliver at least one attack upon the capital or the industrial center of almost any of its neighbors. The stories which have emanated from Spain and from China having to do with the loss of civilians and the destruction of private property have, quite naturally, made a deep impression upon the inhabitants of the capitals of Europe. I think without doubt the fear of mass bombing in that section of the world has had an enormous effect in the psychology of those peoples. I do not say that mass bombing, if inflicted upon London, or Paris, or Berlin, or some other great center of population, would result in the winning of the war by the side which did the bombing. In all probability the world has yet to learn whether mass bombing is actually effective from the military standpoint to the extent now dreaded by people on the other side of the water, but that mass bombing is dreaded and dreaded most acutely by millions of people in Europe cannot be denied. This fear accounts to a considerable degree for the immense importance placed upon war in the air.

I cannot escape the conclusion that at least so far as the art has progressed to this moment and so far as it bids fair to progress within a year or two, or three or four—no one knows just how long the period—no population center of the United States need be in acute dread of mass bombing by an enemy. So I am not quite as panicky as are some people about the menace to continental United States and her centers of population from air attack, although I would not contend that a sudden raid could not be inflicted from a hastily approaching airplane carrier or a secretly established air base. So it seems to me that the mission of our Air Corps in the Army and to a considerable degree the Air Corps of the Navy is somewhat different than that expected to be performed by the air corps, respectively, of great European nations.

As this statement endeavors to set forth, the military policy of the United States is to protect the Western Hemisphere or any part of it from domination by a European or an Asiatic power. This we regard as essential to our national defense, because, if a European power of the aggressor type should secure domination over some country of this hemisphere and from that country launch an attack upon us, then the story would be very different.

We need an air corps not so much to help in the defense of the city of New York or the city of San Francisco, which I cannot conceive to be in dire danger, as we need it to help in the defense of our life line, which is the Panama Canal. It is highly important that we develop an air force which, supplementing the Navy far out at sea, shall prevent an enemy reaching striking distance of the Canal, and then in turn supplement that far-at-sea defense to defend the Canal itself with such effectiveness and thoroughness that even should an enemy break through for a moment it could be repelled.

From the military standpoint that is the suggestion which comes to the House from the minority. May I say a word with respect to our disagreement in the matter of the production of airplanes? As the chairman of the committee has stated, it is the intention of the War Department, should this measure pass in its present form, to embark immediately upon the manufacture of 3,000 new planes. I think testimony before the committee was to the effect that should this legislation pass, the Department would place orders with the industry based almost entirely on present last-approved design—perhaps the phrase "frozen design" was used in the hearing.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman understands, does he not, that the testimony before the committee discloses that the plan of the War Department will not even complete the implemented planes before 1941, and perhaps not then?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do; that is perfectly true. Nevertheless, let me say that if the War Department starts immediately to design the plane and place the orders, while it may be that the last of those planes will not actually be delivered for use to the Army until 1941, nevertheless, the planes will be of date 1939, and that is what I dread, that we place all our production in a single increment; 1940, 1941, and 1942 will come along and each year mark a tremendous change, a tremendous improvement in power, speed, and effectiveness of planes. Not a year goes by without producing enormous improvements, and we propose to you in all good faith that we do not put all our eggs in the 1939 basket.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I challenge the gentleman's statement that there was testimony before the committee that the Department plans to place all of these planes under order. The gentleman, of course, recognizes that no such thing could be done until this House had later authorized funds for such orders.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is perfectly true, but in itself will not change the construction program. It will merely postpone it until the Committee on Appropriations gives them the money.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. The gentleman realizes that the existing authorization is over twice the number of planes now on hand or on order. The existing authorization covers over 4,000 planes, and we have less than 2,000 now on hand under that authorization which has been in existence for some years. This limitation would operate for this year at least, and probably for next year, to actually cut down the existing authorization.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not understand that amendments will be offered to that effect.

Mr. Chairman, I have already consumed nearly all of the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and I prefer to turn back to him the balance of his time and apologize to him for consuming so much of it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes in addition to what I now have remaining.

Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to complete my statement without interruption, and I will leave sufficient time for questions to be asked either the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], or myself at the conclusion of the statement.

Proceeding to the provisions of the bill now before us with an amendment to section 1, which I will outline—the minority believe this to be a reasonable and sound program having to do with the proper defense of what we look upon as the continental United States, referring to the general area Alaska, Hawaii, the west coast, Panama, the Caribbean, and our eastern seaboard. Appropriations under these authorizations would have only to do with the Regular Army, including the Air Corps, with some additions, and the National Guard; in other words, what is termed by the military as our initial protective force of approximately 400,000 men, Regular Army and National Guard.

With your permission, I will give you a summary of the major units of the Regular Army and National Guard in the continental United States, and in our foreign possessions. Practically all Regular Army units in the United States are far below peace strength and many of their components are inactive. In general, units on foreign service are maintained at peace strength.

Regular Army, continental United States: 28 regiments Infantry, 9 tank units, 12 regiments Cavalry (horse), 2 regiments Cavalry (mechanized), 24 regiments Field Artillery, 13 regiments Coast Artillery (harbor defense), 5 regiments Coast Artillery (antiaircraft), 99 squadrons Air Corps (41 combat and 58 base, headquarters, and miscellaneous).

The greater portion of the Infantry, Cavalry, and Field Artillery regiments are organized into nine Infantry and three Cavalry divisions. They are, however, lacking in many important units, with the result that no one division is complete.

Panama Canal Department: 2 regiments Infantry, 1 battalion Field Artillery, 2 regiments Coast Artillery, 11 squadrons Air Corps (6 combat and 5 base and headquarters).

Hawaiian Department: 4 regiments Infantry, 1 tank company, 3 regiments Field Artillery, 4 regiments Coast Artillery (harbor defense), 1 regiment Coast Artillery (antiaircraft), 13 squadrons Air Corps (8 combat and 5 base and headquarters), 1 division which includes the Infantry and Artillery units shown above.

Puerto Rico: 1 regiment Infantry.

Alaska: 1 battalion Infantry.

Philippine Department: 1 regiment Infantry, 2 regiments Coast Artillery, 5 squadrons Air Corps (3 combat and 2 base and headquarters), 1 division Philippine Scouts which includes 2 regiments Infantry (Philippine Scouts), 1 regiment Field Artillery (Philippine Scouts), 1 regiment Cavalry (Philippine Scouts), 2 regiments Coast Artillery (Philippine Scouts).

This comprises the present Regular Army of approximately 165,000 men and at the end of the fiscal year 1939, 12,760 officers.

National Guard, continental United States: 83 regiments Infantry, 18 tank companies, 19 regiments Cavalry, 62 regi-

ments Field Artillery, 14 regiments Coast Artillery (harbor defense), 10 regiments Coast Artillery (antiaircraft), 19 squadrons Air Corps (observation).

The greater portion of the Infantry, Cavalry, and Field Artillery regiments are organized into 18 Infantry divisions and 4 Cavalry divisions. The Cavalry divisions are far from complete.

Hawaiian Department: 2 regiments Infantry.

Puerto Rico: 2 regiments Infantry.

Coming now to the very important question of airplanes for the Air Corps, I think I may safely say that none of the minority members of our committee are panicky or apprehensive as to the possibility of attack by bombings of important localizations on our western or eastern seaboard.

To be sure, we were privileged in committee to hear the expert testimony of our Ambassadors to Great Britain and France and of the high ranking officers of the War Department and the Air Corps. We were not, however, permitted to receive any information from our Ambassador to Germany, who is in this country, nor was our request to hear the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Johnson, granted.

I refer to the latter particularly because through the press and otherwise he is reputed to be the public exponent of the President's original proposal for rearmaments, insofar as planes are concerned. This was looked upon up to as high as 10,000, 15,000, or even 20,000 additional planes. Moreover, there have been and still are current rumors that within this plan was a proposal to take over all aviation manufacturing plants; furthermore, that some of them be relocated or that additional plants be built in other sections of the country. Suffice it to say that we have never been able to obtain an accurate report of the original urging. I believe it may be truthfully stated, however, that in connection with this entire program we find the War Department manned by professional soldiers asking for less than the Executive head of the Government, a civilian. In other words, the figure for airplanes, many of which are to be in reserve, probably represents some compromise.

Referring to the specific provisions of this bill: Therefore, in committee we supported an amendment, which was adopted, reducing the authorization from 6,000 to 5,500 planes as this provision of the bill now reads. Transmitted into appropriations this reduction means a saving of over \$31,000,000.

We are not, however, in agreement with that provision of section I having to do with the authorization permitting the immediate purchase of all the airplanes. Therefore, we submitted in committee the following amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "therefor," to insert the following:

Providing that other than airplanes now on order, or to be on order under the provisions of the War Department appropriation for the fiscal year 1939-40, not more than 1,000 airplanes may be contracted for during any one fiscal year, except in the event of the declaration of a national emergency.

This amendment, which I will offer on the floor tomorrow, was defeated in committee by a vote of 14 to 11.

Pertinent to a consideration of this amendment, we call to your attention the following figures covering the situation having to do with airplanes for the Air Corps—these based upon testimony of Brig. Gen. W. G. Kilner, Assistant Chief of the Air Corps and from other sources:

Number of airplanes	
Authorization for airplanes prior to June 24, 1936.....	1,800
Public, No. 785 (74th Cong.), approved June 24, 1936, increase in authorization.....	2,320
Total authorization present time.....	4,120
With the passage of H. R. 3791, authorized.....	5,500
Airplanes on hand Dec. 31, 1938.....	1,797
To be rendered obsolete or unserviceable by the Secretary of War.....	351
Total net.....	1,446
On contract Dec. 31, 1938.....	558
To be on contract current War Department appropriation bill 1939-40.....	464
Total on hand, on order, or to be ordered.....	2,468
Balance to be ordered under authorization, this bill.....	3,032

The amendment outlined above would in effect limit the number of this balance of airplanes to be ordered, 3,032, to not more than 1,000 in each fiscal year and would, it is carefully estimated, stretch the contracts, labor load, production, and acquisition program for this number of airplanes over 3 years instead of ordering them all immediately. This limitation would have nothing to do with those airplanes now on order, or those to be on order in the coming regular War Department bill and those which from time to time may be rendered obsolete. Even with the adoption of this amendment the War Department would be able to secure an appropriation for and order 2,022 planes this year, with orders in each of the subsequent 2 years for 1,000 more.

We quote herein from the testimony of General Craig:

The number to be procured is 3,032. Of the final total of 5,500 planes that will be on hand in 1941, under present provisions of the bill, 2,163 are to be in reserve. One thousand three hundred and thirty-five of these reserve planes will be combat, and I must call attention to the fact that for these particular planes there will be no trained personnel.

We stress the importance of our suggested amendment because of the ever-present problem of obsolescence. Its adoption would increase opportunity to take advantage of research and experimentation within the Air Corps and otherwise. Unless the amendment is adopted it is the testimony of the Air Corps that the entire 3,032 additional airplanes would be ordered this year under frozen specifications.

It has been frankly admitted by officials in authority before the committee that one of the reasons for the program is to stimulate activity within the general airplane industry. Moreover, it has been indicated that the general attitude of the Air Corps and industry as well is to take as much as they can get now in the thought that within another year or two it might not be possible to secure the necessary appropriation for another thousand planes.

In connection with the desire to stimulate our aviation industry, may we point to the large current increases being made in their purchases in this country by France and Great Britain. Moreover, a report to the Congress by the Secretary of State for the Bureau of Munitions Control confirms the fact that at the present time the American aviation industry to the extent of approximately 40 or 50 companies have foreign contracts for planes, motors, or parts with upward of 50 foreign governments. In addition to France and Great Britain, among these may be listed: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Finland, and many others. Even Germany and Italy have been on our lists for some parts. Also, the Navy Department is placing orders.

We feel sure that most of the industries involved would favor an insured 3-year program of activity with resulting steadier employment of labor rather than what would ensue under the present provisions of the bill. Obviously the suggested amendment would make for less strain on the annual budgets, a very important consideration, each 1,000 planes representing an expense of \$56,000,000. In addition it would be of tactical advantage in what will have to be a rapid training of personnel. May we also call attention to the fact that in the great scientific field specific new metals and alloys thereof are being developed in both this country and in Europe, which is bound to result in great improvement and even redesign of airplanes. At the present time advantage of such developments is being taken by several foreign governments.

It is essential that our Government keep itself in position to take full advantages of scientific research from year to year rather than commit itself to the production now under frozen specifications of the balance of the 3,032 planes in this authorization and I commend the proposed amendment for you favorable action tomorrow.

In conclusion, the Republican Party is committed to the proposition that the American people are determined to direct their energies, not toward war but toward peace.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there any provision in the bill which will protect the mechanical secrets of our War Department from people who come here from foreign governments trying to learn these secrets?

Mr. ANDREWS. I think that is covered by the provisions of the National Defense Act, under the authority of the War Department. There is nothing specific to that effect in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman believe it might be advisable to offer an amendment to further safeguard the mechanical secrets of these airplanes?

Mr. ANDREWS. I think it would be unnecessary.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. In connection with a statement in the report of the Special Committee on National Defense, of which the gentleman from New York is a member, since he is the ranking minority member on the Military Affairs Committee, may I ask him with respect to this particular statement in that report? It is stated:

We entertain serious doubts as to the necessity or wisdom of extending our line of defense as far west as the island of Guam.

Is there anything in this bill having to do with the fortification of Guam in any respect?

Mr. ANDREWS. There is nothing in this bill that would have to do with that question, which is one entirely for the Committee on Naval Affairs at the present time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman tell the Committee what it will cost to service these 5,000 planes on the ground and in the air? Can the gentleman give us an estimate of what that might cost annually?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am unable to give the gentleman an accurate statement on that.

Mr. CULKIN. I have seen the figures stated as \$1,400,000,000. Does the gentleman know whether that is correct or not?

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not. We have been unable to get a definite statement with reference to what the increased cost of maintenance for this program will be.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. General Arnold testified before the War Department Subcommittee on Appropriations on my questioning that it will cost \$230,000,000 a year to operate, maintain, and replace an air force of 5,500 airplanes, 2,200 in reserve and 3,300 in service; that it costs \$50,000 a year to keep each airplane in the air, not including replacement cost.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In connection with the cost of maintenance of aircraft for defense purposes, it may be well at this time in the debate to point out that the cost of maintenance for a single battleship of this Government is more than two and a half million dollars each year, so, comparatively, the cost of maintenance of aircraft is not out of line with the cost of maintenance of battleships.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein certain tables giving the sizes of the armies of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs for more than a month has sat nearly every day except Saturdays and Sundays in the consideration of this bill. Judging from the comparatively small number of Members on the floor, as well as the lack of controversial issues in the bill, it seems almost everyone expects to support the bill. This also seems to me to furnish very good evidence that this is a matter of patriotism rather than of politics. I believe, on the whole, this is a very fine bill or it would not be receiving such unanimous support. It is sane, conservative, and reasonable.

I am always interested in what the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has to say on any issue, and I am happy, too, that my other friend from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], who is the ranking minority member of the committee, and the other members of the minority on the committee, have come to the viewpoint of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the majority members of the committee on this national-defense program because, as far as I know, except for the staggering of the airplane program, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has but expressed the views of the majority almost from the introduction of the bill. I am glad the Republicans have at last agreed with the Democrats about something.

It may be that when the bill is taken up tomorrow for reading under the 5-minute rule amendments will be offered either to strike out or change some language or to add language, but boiled down to its essence I know of nothing controversial left in the bill except the question of whether or not we are going to have 5,500 airplanes within the next 2 years or within the next 3 years.

At present we have a total authorization of 4,120 planes. Of course, we had an authorization last year of approximately 2,300 planes. As I understand, there are now about 1,800 serviceable planes and there are on contract and not yet delivered—although they will be delivered by July 1, 1940—an additional 558 planes. This means that when the present authorization is met we will have under that authorization 4,120 planes; thus we are increasing the program by only 1,380 planes over the next 2 years in addition to what is now authorized. It seems to me comparatively unimportant whether or not you have these additional planes within the next 2 years or the next 3 years.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has not the gentleman omitted from his calculation the obsolete and obsolescent planes, which would be dropped out?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This would make necessary the manufacture at some time or another of 3,000 new planes and not 1,300.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; in the course of time. At present, as I understand from the testimony before the committee, there are 351 obsolescent planes.

Let me tell you how I feel about this matter. I am not an Army man and do not profess to have unusual knowledge on the subject, but I am willing to accept the advice of experts. I was a little bit sorry to hear my other friend from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], whom I esteem highly, inject into this discussion just a little note of what appeared to me to be politics. As far as I know, the committee as a whole has been inclined to follow the recommendations of the War Department. There have been no politicians before the committee. If you will read the hearings carefully you will find the testimony on this bill comes almost exclusively from Army officers on the General Staff, and also the Chief of Staff.

I may say in passing that I believe I voice the sentiment of the House Committee on Military Affairs when I say there is no man in this country, in or out of the Army, who is held in higher regard by those who know him and whose judgment is more highly respected on military affairs than General Craig, the Chief of Staff. [Applause.] The testimony you will find in the hearings is not only by the Chief of Staff

and his deputy but by the other members of the General Staff.

In this connection I am going to give you what I know are the views of the War Department itself, and the representatives of the War Department, I believe, are the ones we should follow in this important matter. They have no profession but the Army and are only interested in the necessary defense of our country.

On the question of whether or not we are going to have contracts let and these planes manufactured within the next 2 years or the next 3 years, let me say that the question of procuring 3,000 airplanes within a specified time depends upon several important factors:

(a) Initial cost; (b) the effect on the aeronautical industry; (c) the purpose of this program; and (d) maintenance.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I am sure I voice the exact sentiments of the War Department on this very important question.

The initial cost. The cost of an airplane is materially reduced if bought in large quantities. If the order is placed initially for all required of a particular type, a production program will be set up for this amount. The same number, if ordered in 3 separate years, would result in three separate and smaller production schedules. The additional cost would be 25 percent, all factors being taken into consideration.

As to the effect on the aeronautical industry, the capacity of the aeronautical industry to produce airplanes after "M" day is a major and vital factor of our war reserve. If we buy 3,000 airplanes at one time, such an order will require the aeronautical industry to adopt quantity-production methods of manufacture and should put all idle aircraft factories to work. The industry is capable of producing these airplanes within the 2-year period, which fact was testified to by all of the high officers in the War Department.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. The airplane industry is credited with being able to turn out 5,500 planes a year at the present time. Does the gentleman realize how many planes would be on order if we were to order only 2,200 planes this year, in view of the number of planes that would be on order for the Navy and that are on order by foreign governments?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know the exact total, but I have the feeling that in view of world conditions today there is a peculiar psychology in this matter in addition to the speeding up of industry and the setting up of proper machinery for mass production of airplanes. We should follow the advice of the War Department, because I believe they know more about the matter and look at it more expertly, although no more patriotically than the rest of us. However, they certainly know what it is all about, as you will find if you attend the executive sessions of the committees dealing with military and foreign affairs. They are in a better position to know world conditions than we, and I am sure we are all agreed that our house should be put in order.

The purpose of this program as announced by the War Department is this:

The proposed 5,500 airplane program is intended to insure the establishment and equipment of an adequate air arm as soon as possible and provide for the essential war reserve. A true war reserve for the Air Corps does not consist of airplanes alone—

And I would like to impress this upon you—

In addition to reserve personnel, it requires an adequate research and development program and an industry which can produce aircraft in quantity.

Maintenance: It is planned that all combat units will be formed within the 2-year period of the program. The airplanes should be available, therefore, to maintain these units at full fighting strength. The additional cost of the reserve combat airplanes will be offset to a large degree by the lower cost of the airplanes initially and by decreased maintenance costs resulting from the rotation of the reserve airplanes through the combat units as spares.

If you listened to the statement made by the chairman of the committee about the number of airplanes that some of the European countries have, plus the testimony that has been provided before the committee that Germany

is capable right now of turning out 1,200 planes per month, I say it is high time that we accept the suggestion and advice of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that we be prepared to meet this condition.

Of course, nobody wants war, and I am sure most of us hope and believe we are not going to have any war, but we are not preparing for war, we are preparing against war.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman tell us the number of planes these other warring countries have at this time?

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], I believe, has provided those figures, but if the gentleman will bear with me a moment, I have them here.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman can put them in the RECORD later.

Mr. THOMASON. I can give them hastily to the gentleman.

Germany right now has 9,800, and I believe I am quoting official figures on this. Great Britain has 7,100, Russia, 5,500; Italy, 4,000; the United States, both Army and Navy, 3,500; Japan, 3,100; France, 2,700; and I may say, too, that while the United States only has 3,500 and Germany today has 9,800, with Germany having the capacity to turn out 1,200 a month, while we are turning out about 200 a month, how do you expect the industry to get keyed up for mass production if we do not let contracts or let them know by some positive evidence that they are going to get contracts big enough to justify them tuning up for mass production?

I do not know that we are facing a crisis just at this moment, and I hope we are not going to face one, but if we expect to let the other nations of the world know, not that we are preparing for any aggression, because ours is purely a defensive program, you have got to show it by your works and you have got to authorize the building of sufficient airplanes and other munitions of war so that they may know we mean business if any one wants to come over here and attack us.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Our friends across the aisle certainly seem somewhat concerned about the matter of obsolescence. If our new planes should become obsolete, is it not equally true that the enormous quantities that the other countries have will become obsolete at the same time?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes, I think the same rule would hold in all parts of the world.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am sure the gentleman will pardon the little realm of doubt we are in, in view of the enormous number of planes some of the foreign countries have, whether any of them are manufactured under specifications which would allow them to come over here and bomb us and then go back again.

Mr. THOMASON. While I do not speak with authority on that subject, I will say that they do not have them now, in my judgment, but at the rate at which they have been increasing their speed and power, I, like the gentleman from New York, do not know what we may expect. So I think we ought to build so that we may be able to meet any emergency.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I may say that General Arnold testified before the War Department Subcommittee on Appropriations that while Army bombers went down to Brazil they traveled stripped. He also testified upon my questioning that there is not a bomber built today that can go over 800 miles, locate its target, drop its load, and return home. This is the testimony of General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps. In face of these facts and in view of what has been said with regard

to an unbalanced program, upon what ground can the gentleman justify the building of 3,000 planes within a 2-year period?

Mr. THOMASON. I know General Arnold wants these planes as soon as he can get them.

Mr. ENGEL. It is in the record. This testimony was given before the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and it is a matter of record.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not dispute that, and I hope it is true. I hope the time never will come when they will develop planes big enough, fast enough, and powerful enough to fly across either one of the two oceans that constitute our boundaries and bomb us and return to their base. We are very fortunate in having the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans on our two sides.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman would not question the word of General Arnold?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course not. I think he is one of the finest and ablest men in the Army; but I know that he said to our committee that in his judgment this very airplane program and the building of those planes within the next 2 years is absolutely necessary for the adequate proper defense of this country. That is what I am pleading for, and I hope you go along with us. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. In connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] on the question of cost and economy, it will be regulated by the Committee on Appropriations, of which the gentleman from Michigan is a member, in the end, will it not?

Mr. THOMASON. I am sure that the gentleman from Michigan will have a lot to do with it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am with the gentleman, and of course I am for this, but I must realize that he used the proper term when he spoke of this "peculiar era of psychology" that we are in. This is not exactly practical, but it is psychology.

Mr. THOMASON. I admit to the gentleman that there is an element of the dramatic about this airplane situation and I do not think we ought to get hysterical, but in answer to the gentleman will say, I do not believe that we need any 10,000 or 15,000 planes, and when men like General Arnold and General Craig appear before the committee and say that they have made a study of world conditions and know how inadequate our Army is, I am willing to follow them, because I have not forgotten the fact that when General Pershing took our boys across the sea to engage in a world war, about the only munitions they had was some rifles, and they had to wait 17 months before he could get the American troops into action. I am one of those who do not want to see that happen again. [Applause.] The only way to do that is to provide, first, the munitions of war, as I view it. And while I am for the airplane program, yet I am one of those who believe, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said, that airplanes have a terrifying effect upon the populace, but if airplanes bomb a city, somebody has to hold it, and, boiled down to its last analysis, that is done usually by the doughboys. I want to stress the munitions and matériel part of this program.

Mr. GIFFORD. And there is no lack of a certain idea in some quarters that we better build these planes because France and England could use them.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; I believe in selling them to France and England—all they can buy and all we can manufacture. Let them come and get them and put the money on the barrel head.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. I was very much interested in that portion of the President's message of January 12, in which he recommended the appropriation of some \$10,000,000 for training some 20,000 civilian air pilots in our colleges. I recognize that this bill does not cover that particular item, but I

would like to know if the gentleman, who is more familiar with the program than I am, feels it would be well for Congress to follow the recommendations of the President and appropriate some \$10,000,000 a year for the purpose of carrying on that student program in our colleges.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; I am for that program. I must say, however, frankly, that there is nothing of that kind in this bill, and that is a matter we must leave for later consideration, when we consider the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Authority or whatever agency may be in control of it. I agree with the War Department about that, if I may digress a moment from what I intended to say in completing my remarks about the airplane situation as I view it, and that is that you will find in this bill, if you read it carefully along with the report, how the War Department expects to obtain its personnel for the manning of these additional airplanes, and it does offer a lot of encouragement to the deserving and competent young men of the country, not through the Civil Aeronautics Authority but through accredited schools of the War Department.

I know in a general way from the press and, perhaps, from the message to which the gentleman referred, that there has been an intimation that the Civil Aeronautics Authority designates certain colleges throughout the country for the initial training of some pilots, but when it comes to this program here itself, this additional personnel is to come from the air schools already accredited or soon to be accredited by the War Department. These are schools, however, that are already equipped for the training of aviators and mechanics.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. In a moment. The new officers under this program are to come from young Reserve officers and the Army Flying School at Randolph Field. There is going to be an increase in this program, along with the planes that have been mentioned, of a little more than 2,000 officers in all branches and perhaps some 25,000 enlisted men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Has the gentleman any evidence before his committee showing how many of these French and British planes are modern, up-to-date, effective planes?

Mr. THOMASON. No; but my information is comparatively few.

Mr. ENGEL. Has the gentleman any idea at all?

Mr. THOMASON. No. I cannot give the gentleman authentic information.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. With reference to the World War analogy which the gentleman used a few moments ago, is there any purpose, secret or otherwise, which is not being disclosed here, that this is preparation for another expeditionary force in 17 months or in any other time?

Mr. THOMASON. Absolutely not. There is not the slightest justification for any such inference. If the gentleman will read the hearings before this committee, he will find that except when a high Army officer said, "No; that might involve a military secret, and I prefer to give it in executive session," there has not been one word given in secret in the testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs. I hope the gentleman will carefully read the hearings. I will add that I would not be surprised to see war in Europe in the next 17 months, and with some wild men running loose, I want this country prepared for any emergency. It would be the best life-insurance policy I know anything about.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I would like to have a little enlightenment in view of the remarks that have been made here about frozen plans for battleships or airships. Do I understand it to be the practice of the Department, if it wants to get an authorization for 100 airships in 1939 and those ships are not completed and delivered until 1941, that we have got to take an airship of the model of 1939?

Mr. THOMASON. No. I am quite sure not.

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is the impression I have received.

Mr. THOMASON. Of all the progressive industries, I think the airplane industry is the most progressive. I think it is safe to say that if they have orders as of 1939 for the building of 100 planes, as the gentleman suggests, and the planes were not even under construction in 1940 or early in 1941, and some new patent had come out and some new device that would make a better plane, I assume that upon the request of the War Department they would certainly adopt the most modern plane. We must take our chances on that, but the War Department is efficient and can be relied upon to do what is best.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Well, I would think so.

Mr. THOMASON. I think that is the common-sense view of the situation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Was there any testimony on the part of the industry as to the speed with which they could step up their production?

Mr. THOMASON. No direct testimony from anyone speaking for the industry, but the substance of General Arnold's testimony was—and that is one of the objects of authorizing the construction of these planes within the next 2 years, so that the orders would be big enough to justify them to tune up and get their plants in proper condition for mass production if that is necessary. I think the committee unanimously agreed that was a wise conclusion. General Arnold has surveyed the industrial situation and knows what he is talking about.

There are one or two other things I would like to mention. One is in connection with personnel, another the Panama Canal, and another the educational orders. The last subject, educational orders, I am going to leave to our colleague from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH], who has done more than any other one person that I know of to build up this sentiment for educational orders. I hope the people in New England and in his district appreciate the very fine and constructive work he has done in this matter of educational orders, of jigs and dies and things like that, so that we will be prepared in the event of any kind of an emergency. [Applause.]

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has also stressed the matter of the importance of the Panama Canal, but along with the Panama Canal, which, of course, is our life line, as he calls it, and we also need a great deal more munitions, coast artillery, and especially anti-aircraft. That is all provided for in this program.

I come back for a minute to this question of personnel. I believe the committee feels deeply on the subject of giving these young Reserve officers of the country an opportunity to get into the service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMASON. The present set-up is to take graduates from the United States Military Academy at West Point, and then from the enlisted men and warrant officers who can meet the requirements. In addition to young Reserve officers, under an act that happens to bear my name, we provide that honor graduates of the senior R. O. T. C. schools of the country are eligible for permanent commissions. We are all proud of West Point, but everybody cannot go to West Point. In the past about the only way a man could get a commission and get into the Regular Army was to go to West Point. I want to enlarge the opportunity for young Reserve officers

and R. O. T. C. honor graduates to get permanent commissions. The Reserve officers of the country constitute in themselves a great peacetime army.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman will recall that General Gasser, who has more information with regard to the personnel than any other man in the War Department, said it was the purpose of the War Department to select the best men from all those sources.

Mr. THOMASON. Oh, yes. That seemed to be the unanimous opinion of the War Department and of the committee. General Gasser is the best authority on this subject that I know and is also one of the best officers in the Army. He has been of great help to our committee.

So I am happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to be no opposition to this bill. I do, however, hope, in view of the specific request, not only as covered by the testimony but as followed up by the War Department, that if we are going to put on this airplane program we will not quibble over whether it is 2 years or 3 years, and they want it in 2 years. Give the War Department what it says it needs and they will defend this country against all enemies. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, this bill which we have before us today is the result of careful study by the Military Affairs Committee of the House on the recommendations contained in the President's message of January 12, 1939, on national defense. As a member of that committee I am vitally interested in this piece of legislation and its passage. Our whole approach to this bill must and will be, I trust, considered entirely from the angle of providing only for an adequate national defense. I do not think that it should become necessary for any Member of this Congress to question any other Member's patriotism or loyalty to country if he to a degree has an honest difference of opinion as to how we might best arrive at gaining the objectives of this plan. Neither should anyone be condemned for calling attention to the pertinent fact that what we do now will be our guide for the next few years.

It might be interesting to the House membership to know that practically all the evidence brought before our committee was through witnesses from the War Department. In these gentlemen we must and do place our greatest confidence. However, at the very beginning it is significant that the Ambassadors to England and France were sent, and I say that advisedly, to appear before a joint session of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and House. Although this meeting was supposed to be executive, the greater part of the testimony appeared in the press the next day.

It is sufficient to state that these ambassadors painted a gloomy picture indeed of the situation which exists in France and England now. Immediately the thought struck me that here again was another case of both England and France "missing the boat" and by getting this information to us, as outlined by the Ambassadors, they would be anxiously awaiting what America's reaction might be to their own deplorable conditions. Strange, it seems to me, that our present Ambassador to Germany, Mr. Wilson, who now and at the time of the hearings was in or near Washington, was not permitted or sent to appear before our committee. Neither was anything offered to our committee from our representatives in any other foreign country as to our need for rearmament. Where was the Honorable Louis A. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, who runs all over this country talking on national defense? Why did he not come before our committee, on invitation, to give us the basis of his many arguments on why America needed this program immediately? I for one never heard a single bit of testimony before our committee, and I attended all the sessions, as to the basis or foundation of the line of reasoning which caused this bill to be brought up so speedily. My conclusions as to why we need to spend this

money now are based on my knowledge of world affairs as they exist at the moment, this knowledge gained through reading of articles of all descriptions, following the day-by-day maneuverings of the East and in Europe, my conversations with the officers of the War Department, and the frank knowledge that at this very moment we are sadly lacking in supplies, matériel, and implements of war of most every description to even sufficiently man and equip our present peacetime authorized strength of 165,000 enlisted men and 12,760 commissioned officers. Among the major powers of the world our military establishment, as to numerical strength, is way down the list. But back of this I would like to know if there might possibly be some other intent or purpose, some thought that we might be preparing for more than a mere adequate defense. Are we sure that is all we are doing?

All indications at the moment force us to the conclusion that the majority of the American people feel the present request for national defense is a reasonable one and might well be undertaken, providing that the Congress use its own best judgment. The country wants all hands above the table when the defense cards are being dealt. They want the whole Congress to sit in on the game and each one take his turn dealing. The American people have a right to know what dangers are threatening our national security and to know just how far our Government is committed to foreign nations. More light should be thrown on the subject, with less heat and loose talk.

The newspapers of a day or so ago carried a picture of one of 250 of the latest type airplanes being shipped from this country to England. True, American airplane manufacturers may sell their products abroad under certain conditions, but is our own national defense in any way being jeopardized or are we in any danger of becoming involved in Europe. The recent crash in California of one of the latest type military airplanes, in which a French representative was involved, brings to mind that perhaps we do not have any military secrets worth protecting. The American people are paying the freight, and on Congress rests the duty of how and when expenditures for national defense should be made.

There can well be differences of opinion in this body on some of the methods of procedure under this bill. As one who signed the minority report, I have no desire to oppose or delay our getting under way the necessary steps to build up needed defense. I do feel, however, that we might well consider the slowing down to a certain degree the procurement of the total number of planes contemplated in this bill, to expand that program over a period of 3 or 4 years, and I am not motivated by a desire to hamstring, cripple, or delay the War Department in any manner or form. On the contrary, it is an honest and sincere wish on my part to have at hand at the conclusion of any such program as this, airplanes of the latest type and design, made possible only through further research, experimentation, and study. Airplanes can only be procured at a certain rate per annum under conditions now existing in the airplane industry. Stretching this program out over a longer period will afford the manufacturers the necessary time to equip themselves to turn out better and even better planes without the necessity of seeing specifications frozen, were all new planes ordered at once. Some day every last one of these planes will be obsolete and will have to be replaced. Are we then going to replace them all at one time in order to maintain the strength that our military experts tell us is so necessary. For my part I would like to see more of the money to be authorized under this bill set aside for additional research and development of the airplane.

I agree with the statement of Mr. Hull, Secretary of State, that—

The American people are convinced there are no international differences which cannot be settled, with far greater benefit to all concerned, by mutually fair and peaceful adjustment than by armed force.

Also I concur in what Mr. Lippmann writes:

For my own part, I do not believe that war is inevitable, and, from what I can learn, this is the view of the men here and abroad who have the best means of knowing the actual situation

in the world. If the governments, with the backing of public opinion, are sufficiently cool, clear-sighted, and resolute, the peace can still be saved by diplomacy.

Notwithstanding strong talk on the part of some of the dictators, I doubt seriously if they have any intentions of casting covetous eyes in our direction, I cannot subscribe to a policy of warning totalitarian powers that we will meet any attack upon our national and international interests by a determined defense and resistance. Of course we will resist and defend; but what is the use of shouting to the housetops that we will do so? To my mind that is not diplomacy. Every country in the world capable of defending itself, will never willingly submit to the usurpation of its rights and territory by another. Let us slow up in taking sides and making loud talk with an accusing finger pointed here or there.

Due to our many advantages, chiefly our geographical location, I do not feel that it should ever become necessary for America to find herself drawn into another war. Much, of course, hinges on our attitude toward and carrying out of the ideas embodied in the Monroe Doctrine of December 1823. I have only recently read and reread that doctrine, and I wish every Member of this House would do likewise. Let me quote a little part therefrom:

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the governments de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries to none.

But in regard to those continents, circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political systems to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord.

It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them.

It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense.

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amiable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course.

In building our national defense let us keep free from all tangling alliances or secret agreements. Let us attend to our own business at home, concerning which at the present time there is plenty for us to do. Let us not be drawn into another war by an empty cry to again "help make the world safe for democracy," realizing as we do today that in the short space of 20 years we have less democracy existent in the world than at any time in the last century. Let us not forget that those who would have us ally ourselves with them divided the spoils of the last war, while America, fighting for what at that time was clearly considered a sincere and honest principle, finds today that the very countries who were our allies only gave us a debt which they now fail to recognize. Let us not forget that these years of depression, need, and want found their inception in the World War, and today we are paying the price, with the end not yet in sight. Let us face the bare truth, that we might not be able to withstand another world war; and in the end, though win it we would, we might find liberty, freedom, our economic system, and even civilization itself destroyed. We can save our democracy and liberty in America regardless of what results eventually materialize in Europe.

In conclusion, let me call your attention to the following facts: When we entered the World War we had a national debt of approximately \$1,000,000,000. Today we have a \$40,000,000,000 debt. The last World War in money cost the United States over \$40,000,000,000. Add the cost of another and more expensive war to our present financial set-up, and we find we might easily be in debt to the tune of seventy-

five to one hundred billion dollars. Such a circumstance might be the beginning of the end of our great country.

In our endeavors to equip ourselves with an adequate national defense, let us keep our feet firmly on the ground and avoid all the dangers and pitfalls made possible by having placed in our hands, for defense, such instrumentalities of defense which this country has never known before, and which, pray God, this country will only and always use as a means to avoid, and as a deterrent to, any future war. I cannot forget the story of the three men: One who traveled about without weapons of defense, for he was not thinking about trouble. The second man carried one gun, for he thought he might encounter some difficulty and would be ready. The third man carried two guns, and feeling ready and strong, went out looking for trouble.

Somewhere I read the following four short lines in verse, which are so apropos to our situation at the close of the last war, in which position we never again want to find ourselves:

Disillusion came at dawning  
When we paused to count the dead,  
When we stood to view the wreckage  
And beheld the clouds ahead:

Our duty to our country is to adequately prepare for defense, keep from foreign entanglements and alliances, mind our own business, procure plenty of powder, keep it dry, and keep it at home in the event of the coming of any nation who might not be aware of the fact that we are a great country, adequately prepared to defend ourselves. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 27 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER].

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this happens to be St. Valentine's Day. If this House is about to send valentines to Herr Hitler and the other dictators of Europe, I believe its message with reference to the Western Hemisphere will be much more effective and more definitely understood if we follow the recommendations of the majority and authorize the entire air program at once.

The immediate objective of this bill is national security. Your committee brings this bill to the House after the receipt of the President's messages, after hearing first-hand from our Ambassadors to England and France of the situation in Europe, and after detailed testimony from responsible heads of the War Department and the Army. No war hysteria has motivated your committee or will influence this House in the passage of this bill. We are all going to keep our feet on the ground, look this problem in the face, and give sober and serious thought as to the very best way in which we can implement the Nation and preserve it from exterior force. None of us ever want the United States to be placed in a position where she must pay tribute or through fear of force be compelled to make an unconscionable settlement of international issues. We are resolved that our manhood shall not be utilized in fighting anyone else's war, nor shall we engage in any war of aggression.

When we talk about national defense and our plans for the protection of this country through our armed forces, we mean just what those words imply. With us defense means defense. The authorizations contained in this bill are what might be called the irreducible minimum of what should be done at this time. I need not tell you air power was decisive at Munich. For the first time in the history of the world nations with the most powerful armies and navies backed down to that nation having air supremacy. As a member of your Committee on Military Affairs I visited the Panama Canal and realize its defense needs. I have taken time to see many Air Corps fields and installations, the training center at Randolph and Kelly Fields, Tex. My inspection has taken me in the past 4 or 5 years to many of the plants of the aircraft industry—factories where planes, engines, propellers, and instruments are being produced. I have visited the laboratory at Langley Field of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

This bill is the legislative reply to the President's recommendations upon national defense to this Congress. It is our answer to the insistent demand of the people of the United

States that we put our house in order. The great majority of Americans are disturbed over recent happenings in Europe. They are uncertain as to what is going to occur there and are concerned over what we should do. There is no question about their desire to stay out of the quarrels of Europe. They are opposed to any alliances of any kind that might make it necessary for us to go to the assistance of some European power.

They do believe in maintaining the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere. They fear the totalitarian states will endeavor to establish themselves in the Americas. They view with alarm the situation abroad and are skeptical of the ability of our Government to keep this country from becoming embroiled in a war of major proportions in Europe. Our traditional plan or theory of national defense has in no way changed since the early days of the Republic. Our geographical position remains our greatest national-defense asset. Today our defense plans must be molded to the modern pattern. A new arm has been added to the offensive and defensive power of nations. Aircraft are of ever-increasing importance in warfare. Their speed and range annihilate space and distance, and they have become a horrible menace to the noncombatants as well as to the military forces of nations engaged in armed conflict. Spain and China are examples of the havoc and suffering of civilian populations under bombardment from modern aircraft. It will not be possible for me, in the short time I have, to discuss paragraph by paragraph the details of this measure. Suffice it to say that the two principal phases of national defense which your committee considers most important are covered by this bill.

First. There is the increase in the authorized air force of the Army. An authorization of only some 1,400 planes over the number formerly specified, although prior legislation limited acquisition of those authorized to 2,320 planes. It was expected that this program would be fully completed by June 30, 1940. Now we propose to increase the Air Corps by additional planes so that we will have not to exceed 5,500 planes by midyear of 1941.

The second principal objective of this legislation is to arm with modern equipment what is considered the initial protective force. This consists of the Regular Army and the National Guard with a peace strength of approximately 400,000 men and a war footing of something over 700,000. The authorizations included in this bill will not provide for this force when mobilized on an emergency basis, but will help materially in properly equipping the 400,000 men that would be immediately available. In view of the tremendous expenditures that have been made for national defense in recent years, it hardly seems possible that we are so lacking in modern equipment. Yet when we take the principal items included in last year's War Department appropriation bill for military purposes, we find the bulk of Army expenditures are for other than armament and munitions. For instance, appropriations for this fiscal year include \$40,000,000 for pay of civil personnel, \$168,000,000 for pay of the Army, \$30,000,000 for subsistence, nearly \$13,000,000 for transportation, including purchase, maintenance, and operation of equipment; \$13,000,000 for clothing, \$10,000,000 for new construction; \$12,000,000 for maintenance and repair of posts and stations, \$1,000,000 for medical purposes; \$89,000,000 for aviation and munitions, \$6,000,000 for sea coast defense, \$61,000,000 for cost of civil components exclusive of the item above of pay of civil personnel.

These items of more than \$440,000,000 of the total appropriations of \$460,000,000 have in the main little to do with increasing our armament with, perhaps, the exception of the Air Corps appropriation. We have few antiaircraft guns. Only about half of our field guns, 75-millimeter, are equipped with modern mobile carriages. We have scarcely any anti-tank equipment, and our small arm is the Springfield rifle brought out in 1903.

This bill envisions bolstering our coast defenses, spending considerable money at Panama, including quarters for an adequate garrison. Most of us realize that it is the duty of

Congress to make the Panama Canal impregnable. We must keep our defense lifeline between the oceans open.

The Monroe Doctrine has become once more a very important policy of the United States. Hemisphere defense necessarily is a selfish doctrine with us. Its prime modern consideration is the successful defense of the Panama Canal and the prevention of the establishment of military bases in the Americas by hostile powers. Our ability to utilize the Panama Canal at all times means that we can defend twice as much coast line with half as many battleships. It enables us to concentrate all of our attacking naval force in either one of two directions, an advantage that no enemy of ours or any combination of enemies could ever have. One has but to glance through the pages of our history to realize that the American people have never believed in any considerable standing Army, nor do we now need a large Army for defense. However, we have continuously through the years neglected our small land forces and their preparation and equipment has never been adequate at the outbreak of any of the major wars in which we have engaged. We do not need to worry today about personnel, the men and officers that constitute our Regular Army and likewise the National Guard. We have, also, under the wise provisions of the National Defense Act, established the organized Officers' Reserve, the volunteers who now number nearly 100,000, and who give unselfishly of their time and effort and who will be available for the training of any civilian army that might have to be formed in the future. Their ranks, as you all know, now consist in large part of the graduates of our colleges and universities, who have had the advantage of advanced Reserve Officers' Training Corps instruction. In the event of any major national emergency we shall depend, as we always have in the past, upon an Army recruited from the young manhood of our country coming from civil life. We do need to worry, however, about the equipment of our initial protective forces, which would have to be utilized in defending the United States until a civilian army could be gathered together and equipped. At present the fire power and mobility of our small Army are most deficient. We have models of weapons that are said to be very efficient as far as world standards are concerned, and in this connection we refer to mobile carriages for guns, the automatic rifle, antitank guns, mechanized equipment, including tanks and other modern equipment, but we have scarcely any of these articles. Our Atlantic coast defenses are most deficient. We are providing minimum needs in antiaircraft guns, together with searchlights and fire-control equipment, and other tremendous steps forward will be taken when appropriations are made under this authorization. The placing of experimental orders with scores of firms in private industry, so that important factories will be equipped to turn out in increasing quantities those articles which are most needed in time of war will help our Army greatly. Much highly developed equipment is so complex, so delicate, and made with such precision that without experience it is most difficult even in a thoroughly industrialized country like America to hastily change from the arts of peace to the necessities of war.

You will find in the copy of the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, beginning on page 4, the statement of Gen. Malin Craig, Chief of Staff; his detailed explanation of the expenditures contemplated by this authorization is both clear and convincing. I am sure that you will be well repaid by reading General Craig's testimony.

Personally, I would like to see more money spent upon aeronautical research. The President's recommendation of utilizing the facilities at Sunnyvale, Calif., as well as the laboratories at Langley Field for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, is promising. One of the most important factors in Germany's bid for military air supremacy has been her devotion to the cause of scientific aeronautical research. Tremendous physical facilities have been made available to German scientists and many of them have been engaged in research of this nature since Germany started its air program in 1933. If we are to keep abreast of the most modern developments in aircraft, we must make ample

provision for research. Let me return to a discussion of military aviation, because doubtless in the minds of the American people this is the most important part of this expansion program. There are many in this country who believe that all we need for national defense is a super and superior air force. They think any war could be won through mastery of the air. Knowingly and unknowingly they are the exponents of the great Italian general Giulio Douhet, who argued most convincingly that any war could be won through the air. To accomplish this Douhet maintained that an air-minded nation must not have mere temporary supremacy in military air operations but have such mastery of the air through its military aircraft that it could speedily bring about the complete destruction of all enemy aircraft, their plants for aircraft construction, their bases and sources of supply, their public utilities, and their industrial establishment, thus bringing the enemy to his knees in short order. Douhet's theory of warfare might well apply to Europe with nations in close proximity to each other. Who knows but that Douhet foretold what was to occur at Munich by reason of Germany's excellent air strength. However, we in the United States are not crowded in among the nations of Europe. Thousands of miles of ocean separate us from our nearest enemy and to operate successfully an air force of the size and strength sufficient to subjugate this country would mean the establishment of aircraft bases in the vicinity of our territory, which we should be able to prevent. A military base is not a mere landing field. There must be ample camouflage storage for hundreds of planes, tremendous supply maintenance and repair installations.

This brings me to a question which doubtless we shall have to face in the future under our system of separate administrations of the Army and the Navy, each with its independent air force, which is a necessary complement of other branches of the respective services. The Army is charged with coast defense, with the fortification and defense of the Panama Canal. Its planes are land-based planes, and I believe that it needs little argument to demonstrate that land-based planes can have greater range, greater striking power, and far more mobility than aircraft carrier-based planes. Let us largely confine long-range bombing missions to the Army Air Corps. It is quite apparent from the world figures upon the capacity of aircraft carriers that any nation or group of nations would have an insurmountable task in attacking this country through the medium of aircraft based on carriers. This presupposes that our fleet is not completely annihilated and that we maintain an air force of sufficient size and power.

At the present time the aircraft-carrier capacity of the leading nations is as follows:

Great Britain: 6 carriers with a total capacity of 225 planes; 5 carriers building with total capacity of 300 planes.

Germany: 2 carriers under construction, capacity of 80 planes; none available now.

Italy: No airplane carriers.

France: 1 carrier, capacity of 40 planes; 1 carrier under construction, capacity unknown.

Japan: 6 carriers with a total capacity of 240 planes; 1 carrier building, capacity unknown.

While I have already covered the major questions of policy which indicate the need for the expansion of our air forces, I think I should devote some time to the reasons which have led your committee to recommend that the total authorized strength of 5,500 planes should be set as an immediate goal, and that we should build up to this authorized strength as rapidly as possible. Some of my good friends across the aisle, who are ready to say that we need an air force of 5,500 planes for our Army, still seem to think that we should take 3 years to build these planes. Mr. Chairman, I cannot stand here on the floor of this House and tell you how many planes we will need 3 years from now.

I cannot tell you that in that period of time the aggressor nations of the world will have found a way to live at peace with other nations. I cannot tell you that within that period we will not be embroiled in a fight to the death for all that we hold dear, nor can any man stand before

this House today and tell you that the part the United States must play in every move to continue peace and prevent war within the next 3 years will not be strengthened by a manifest and determined effort, started now and prosecuted with the utmost vigor, to make our air power so strong that no nation can believe that it has the power to defeat us in conflict or force our submission through threats.

Air power is one of the most elusive forces on which peaceful nations must depend for their protection. Compared to other component parts of military strength, air power is a fickle mistress, whose affection cannot be won overnight or relied on unless constantly cultivated. Eternal vigilance, eternal research, eternal strengthening of our manufacturing facilities, and eternal training of personnel, each form a part of the price we must be prepared to pay for that superiority in the air which is our best guaranty of peace in this hemisphere.

Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, in an address to the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense here at Washington on January 25 this year, made some very pertinent remarks upon the necessity of prompt action upon an increase in our aerial forces. General Arnold said:

One commentator who has been quoted widely of late has said that a nation should not build up an air force until it knows when it is going to war. My answer to that is that it is comparable to saying that no man should insure his house except in the year it is going to burn down, or no man should insure his life except in the year he is going to die. Our contention is that modern air forces of suitable size are the best national insurance against unwarranted aerial attack by ambitious aggressors. Since we cannot be definitely sure when those attacks are to come and when that aggression is to head our way, wisdom decrees that we take out that insurance with the least possible delay.

What would seem a well-founded objection to building an air force today is that it will be obsolete tomorrow because of the rapid changes that the aviation industry is making in airplane types. Our flying fortress was designed more than 4 years ago. We have had them in service for more than 2 years. They are still the best bombing airplanes in the world, and there is no prospect that anything being developed abroad will make them obsolete for several more years. Our present formula, and it is based on world experience, is that our fighter craft will remain efficient, usable, and entirely satisfactory for from 4 to 6 years. Our bombing planes developed to date will remain up-to-date and efficient weapons for at least 5 or 6 years, or perhaps longer, while our miscellaneous types, such as training and cargo, have a much longer useful life of from 8 to 10 years. Roughly, therefore, in order to keep our 5,500-plane program modern and up-to-date, we will need to replace not more than one-fifth of the planes each year, and those 1,000 airplanes should be procured annually in order to keep in being the aircraft industry, one of the most essential parts of our war reserve. You can see, therefore, that air forces do not of necessity present an alarming obsolescence rate; and bear this fact well in mind, that this obsolescence rate on our own air force is no greater than that of other air forces in the world.

We dare not wait to build up an air force until we can standardize on the best possible airplanes, for if we did we would never build an air force at all. When we go into production on any given airplane, there is a better airplane around the corner; there is always on the drawing board or in the laboratory undergoing test an experimental plane of superior performance to that which we are buying in quantity. Remember, though, that an experimental airplane is always at least 2 or 3 years away from production quantity, and remember this: Experimental airplanes, or drawings of superior airplanes, did not win for the Germans at Munich. The air forces which affect international negotiations consist of airplanes in being with combat and maintenance crews available and air bases in existence from which to operate them. It is also of importance to note that it requires about 2 years to select and train those highly technical men who make up combat and maintenance crews.

Speaking before the annual meeting of the National Aeronautic Association on the 16th of last month, the commanding general, General Headquarters Air Force, Gen. Frank M. Andrews, made the following significant statement:

No one knows better than you gentlemen that air power is not a commodity that can be procured in the open market, no matter how much gold and silver may be available. Money will not buy it; desire will not create it. Timely foresight, based upon an intelligent conception of the potentialities of air power and its effect upon the destiny of nations, is the only formula that can assure its development.

The ability of a nation's industry to build airplanes and the existence of superior manpower available for training as pilots, navigators, mechanics, etc., do not make air power. They do

constitute potential air power. However, it must be realized that it takes time to build a force of modern military aircraft, and further time to train the men to fly those airplanes and maintain them on the ground.

The existence of potential air power is important if it is utilized to create actual air power before the necessity arises to use it. The most fertile agricultural regions would be of no value to save a people from starvation unless they were sown with crops and those crops harvested before the spectre of famine presented itself.

So it is with potential air power. Unless developed before the emergency occurs it will be of little value afterward; not only because of the time factor involved, but also because aircraft factories and engine factories are early objectives of a hostile air force.

I repeat, adequate air power cannot be created after the necessity for its need has arisen. Like a navy, it takes years to build an air force.

I quote again from General Andrews:

As we study the development of air power today, and as we project ourselves into the very near future and realize its possibilities, it seems to me that there can be little doubt in the minds of any citizen of this country that the United States must lose no time in building up an air force.

As much as all of us would like to find a formula for universal peace, history has proven beyond doubt that the ability to defend one's self has always been the deciding factor in the security and life of a nation.

Air power is imperative for the security of this Nation and its policies. Its possession by this country, in adequate decree in our military organization, will constitute strong insurance that no hostile army will ever approach either coast for the purpose of landing on our shores; and that no hostile nation will ever establish air bases in this hemisphere. It will provide additional freedom of action to our Navy.

With the passing of each year, air power will become more and more vital in the shaping of the policies of nations.

These words come from one of our keenest students of military tactics. General Andrews knows that the present relative weakness of England and France in air power is due to the fact that these countries did not start soon enough, and did not have time to properly plan the development of their aircraft manufacturing programs. For us to make the same mistakes, which have cost them so dearly, would be tragic, and would provide the most tangible form of encouragement to dictators who already boast that democracies are too inefficient and disorganized to provide for themselves the necessary forms of self protection in our modern world. On the other hand, the successful accomplishment of the program which our committee has recommended, will do more than any other single thing to show enemy-watching nations that we mean to defend ourselves and our liberties against any and all threats, and that we are ready, willing, and able to do so.

A few moments ago I stated that no man could tell this House what air power we might need to command for our protection 3 years from now. To say that we will take 3 years to fill the needs we know exist today is to admit that 3 years from now we will still be far behind. It will likewise be interpreted by unfriendly nations as an admission that we are unable to repair our weaknesses at a more rapid pace.

Mr. Chairman, our responsibility for the safety and security of this great Nation cannot be discharged by building only 1,000 planes a year for the next 3 years. We are faced with a situation in which we must use every bit of available trained manpower and every tool and fixture in every airplane manufacturing plant in this country, and we must stretch every sinew in our aircraft industry to build and make ready for use the full measure of air power provided in this bill. Potential air power is not enough. We must provide actual air power in the form of modern fighting aircraft and all necessary personnel and bases. I anticipate considerable criticism through lack of understanding of the planes which are to be placed in reserve. These will number in excess of 2,100. One thousand three hundred and thirty-five of those in reserve will be various types of combat planes. These reserve planes will be distributed to depots and tactical units. They constitute in reality a rotating reserve. For instance, the reserve planes with tactical units will be placed in operating commission at any time any operating plane is undergoing repairs at the station of the units. Likewise, those planes in reserve at depots will be ready to instantly replace airplanes of the operating forces that are sent there for major overhaul or in

event the planes are washed out. In other words, these reserve planes will be ready for instant service in creating new units in event of emergency, and in peacetime as a constantly rolling reserve in replacement of damaged or washed-out planes.

Several hundred of these planes in reserve will be used by National Guard units and for the training of Air Corps Reserve officers of inactive-duty status. There are 25 stations where Army Reserve pilots may fly in such a status. There are but 124 planes in the 3,000 active planes in this program or but 5 per station; the remainder are in the reserve of 2,000 planes. Thus it is clear that the elimination of the planes in reserve in the program will eliminate much of the training at our reserve stations scattered widely over the country—one of the strong links in our defensive structure. These reserve planes are to be used also to replace losses in National Guard plane strength. The air elements in our civilian components will suffer irreparable damage by the elimination of these planes listed as in reserve in this program.

In reality they constitute not more than a safe reserve, which is recognized as approximately 50 percent of operating planes, and that ratio is maintained today by the Navy in recognition of its mission, which requires instant readiness for service.

Fortunately for this Nation, we have an aircraft industry that is ready to undertake the program authorized in this bill and carry it forward to completion with a minimum of delay. The Air Corps and the industry have developed planes that will fill our needs and are ready to be put into quantity production. The industry as a whole is now using only about one-third of its available production capacity, which means that idle men and idle plants will be put to work in this program, and we will be providing employment at the same time we are providing air power for our security. Before I conclude these remarks, may I emphasize again the great importance of carrying out this program in strict accordance with the recommendations of your committee. One thousand planes a year will not accomplish the objective we have sought. We have recommended a program we are sure the Air Corps and the aircraft industry can accomplish. We know that the completion of this program in the time allotted will not only greatly strengthen our air power but will show every other nation in the most convincing manner possible that we can and will protect our vital interests. We know also that should we be so unfortunate as to be forced into armed conflict in our own defense, our aircraft industry would be geared up to meet the heavy demands that would fall on it in such an emergency. Finally, we know that the per-plane cost to the Government will be at least 20 to 25 percent less than it would be under the 3-year plan.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge, with all the force at my command, that this program be adopted as recommended by your committee and set forth in this bill. Peace for the United States and for the Western Hemisphere under honorable terms which protect our liberties and vital interests is the objective we have sought, and which we believe this bill will go far toward accomplishing.

It is the duty of Congress to recognize its responsibility for protecting our borders and preserving peace. The struggle between our way of life and that imposed on an increasing number of Europeans is of tremendous proportions and importance. If our institutions are to survive, if we are to continue to exist as a nation wedded to those principles of government for which our forefathers fought and died, we are but doing those things which are most necessary in the passage of this bill.

Let us definitely remember that all of our military advisers from the Chief of Staff down, including the Chief of the Air Corps, advise the immediate purchase of the additional planes authorized rather than the staggering of their purchase over a 3-year period.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with any statement which I have prepared I would like to mention

one or two things which have already been taken up in connection with this bill. The debate has proceeded on the assumption that there is no emergency under which we are acting. It is said that Gen. Malin Craig, the Chief of Staff, is anxious for this authorization to go through at once, but if you turn to the top of page 3 of the hearings you will see that he said that he urgently recommended that \$50,000,000 of the \$300,000,000 be made available at once for the purchase of military aircraft.

Many statements have been made this afternoon as to the productive capacity of our present aircraft plants. It is true, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], that not a single person connected with the industry has been before the committee. The chairman of the committee stated in answer to a question that the productive capacity is between 10 and 30 planes per month; other Members say it is from 30 to 40 a month. Right after the President issued his message in connection with his program, Leighton W. Rogers, president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, said in making public the results of a survey just completed—and this is taken from an article that appeared in the New York Times on Friday, January 13, 1939—that the aircraft manufacturing industry of the United States can double its current production with the present plant space.

Mr. Rogers' report stated that the industry could deliver 5,500 military planes a year with existing plant area.

The American factories—and there are plenty of them—are not so poorly equipped. As to whether they can turn out 30 or 40 airplanes a month, this statement shows that in 1938 the industry's production aggregated approximately 3,675 planes of all types. Of that production there were 150 transports, 300 private and business planes, 1,425 light planes, and about 1,800 military craft, including those produced for export.

He goes on to state that, contrary to popular belief, the industry is nowhere near capacity production and that some of our important plants have practically no business. The survey showed, Mr. Rogers reported, that the 1938 average of 150 military planes a month had been stepped up toward the close of the year to an average of about 200 craft.

He goes on to state:

Some plants which have heretofore produced only commercial planes would be available to participate in such a military program.

No important factory expansion will be necessary for either the military or commercial manufacturers, although there might be minor additions in some cases.

Mr. Rogers' report also stated that experience had shown that about 6 months were required for training labor and 8 or 9 months for tooling up and jig installation. This does not mean that 6 months would be required to start production, but deliveries of most models could start immediately because they are already in production on present orders. As the plants completed their tooling operations, deliveries would increase progressively until at the end of 8 or 9 months full production would be reached. According to him, that does not require much plant expansion.

Let us now turn to the testimony of General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, whose arguments are supposed to be behind this program. On page 9 of the hearings he tells us why we are getting this program at this time in one of his early sentences:

This present program has been made possible by the sympathetic attitude of the public, the change in the world conditions, and the message of the President to Congress.

I do not believe any of us think there was any other reason than the fact that the President was willing to have this program come forward at this time. Then let us turn to page 10. General Arnold there states:

The labor employed in American aircraft factories is somewhere in the neighborhood of 27,000. That figure is almost a constant figure.

He goes on to state that this "total has been almost standard at about 27,000 for the last 2 or 3 years."

Turning to the next page, we find the statement that if we put this program into effect, "the 27,000 men we now have will probably be doubled or even trebled." New labor that goes into these plants must be trained.

Then let us turn to page 17 and find out about this emergency proposition. No one so far has argued that there is any emergency, but General Arnold stated at that time in answer to a question by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]:

In my opinion, it is a question of whether you think we have an emergency here confronting us. If we have an emergency confronting us, then we must use emergency measures during the period of the emergency to get maximum production of planes.

On the next page he says he thinks there is such an emergency.

The gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] got down to the nut of the proposition when he asked General Arnold, on page 23, the purpose of this program. Major General Arnold answered:

It has a double reason. First, to get airplanes; secondly, to try for once—

He says "for once," remember—

to see just what productive capacity this country is able to build up, and to build up a reserve in case of emergency of war planes as part of our reserve and to treat them as such.

I do not think a good program for this country is one that involves seeing how many planes these airplane factories can produce in any one year. Who is going to be left holding the bag? As I understand the situation at the present time, we have 1,797 planes, of which 351 are obsolete. We have 1,022 planes on order at the present time or to be ordered under terms of the current War Department appropriation bill. If we provide for 5,500 planes under this program, Major General Arnold or the War Department will be in a position to order 4,054 planes at once. That is, those already on order, 558, plus those in the current appropriation bill, 464, plus the 3,032 more provided by this program. We will then have 4,054 planes immediately on order, and to be delivered at staggered times, true, but 4,054 on order, and presumably all of them to be built in the next 2 years.

The Army will go to the airplane factories, some of which are busy on French, English, or other foreign or local machines. Their owners will see the picture on the wall and will not care to expand. They will then give these orders to the factories which are idle. What will be the result? We have only 27,000 men capable of producing airplanes at the present time. Everyone of them is presently employed and has been steadily employed, as a matter of fact, for the last 5 years. This being so, they are going to treble this force, according to Major General Arnold, and we will then have 75,000 to 81,000 men so employed. This is an addition of some 50,000 men to this industry.

These men will be employed right up until July 1, 1941, and perhaps for a few weeks or months thereafter, but from that date on they will be dropped. What is going to happen to the airplane manufacturers who have been busy with their expanded plants, with their new machinery, all ready for mass production to go right straight along, when they have to discharge 50,000 men out of their factories and close down, because on the face of the situation there will not be any more military work for them at that time? The answer, of course, is that back will come the Air Corps asking for the right to order 4,000 more planes to keep the plants going for an additional 2 years, or else the Navy will take its turn and ask for 4,000 planes.

I have a particular reason for mentioning this fact. I believe the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] in which he would require a limitation to be placed on the number of planes built in any one year, is a sound one. Major General Arnold, in his testimony, states that airplanes become obsolete in 5 years. In other words, he states that every airplane built 5 years ago is now obsolete. Perhaps some may be good for transport service, or some may be used for training purposes, but as fighting equipment every one of them has gone by the

board. Having that for a background, we ought to go mighty slow and we should give a lot of consideration to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Under the proposed amendment, to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the Air Corps is not shut off cold by any means. It has on order at the present moment, or almost certain to be ordered, 1,022 planes and it can still go ahead and ask for 1,032 more planes, or a total of 2,054 planes and have them all on order by June 30 of this year or shortly thereafter. In view of the fact that General Arnold states that a 5-year program is the proper kind of an air program, I will ask anyone if it is not reasonable to assume that we ought to provide for a straight, steady program of 20 percent every year, plus replacements?

If we will refer back to the act of 1926, we will find that at that time a 5-year program was entered upon. A limitation was placed upon replacements in Army planes to 400 a year, so that what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] proposes is not new. We are going to continue a provision of a law that is now in force, but we step it up from 400 to 1,000, with the exception that we do not allow the Air Corps to jump up to the maximum number at once. We do give them the right to build 2,054 planes this year, or at least have them on order, and then provide for 1,000 a year thereafter. So long as we have a program covering 5,500 planes as the maximum, I feel the program suggested by the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is absolutely sound. If we do not adopt some such program, we are going to have a sick industry in 1941 when it is expanded to treble its present capacity, with no place to go after that time.

It is certain that France and Great Britain will be out of the market in 1941 unless they are engaging in a war then. By that time we know that both Great Britain and France will have built up their factories to their needed capacity and will have available an airplane fleet of such numbers that it will not be necessary for them to come over to the United States and pay high prices, putting American workmen to work in American-owned factories. It is not sound business, and it is not sound politics.

Mr. Chairman, when I started to speak I had in mind the President's program. Briefly, there were five phases to it, the first of which was that the War Department should have the right to expend \$32,000,000 for educational orders to prepare industry to meet urgent wartime needs; second, \$110,000,000 to equip our Regular Army and National Guard, our so-called initial protective force of 400,000 men; third, \$6,539,287 for fortifications in Panama, Hawaii, and the United States; fourth, \$27,000,000 to increase the permanent garrison of the Panama Zone; and, fifth, \$300,000,000 for airplanes, men, and facilities for the Army Air Corps. This program requires authorizations in regard to only the first, fourth, and fifth numbers. Insofar as the \$110,000,000 to equip the Army and the \$6,500,000 for coast defenses are concerned, they do not come under this bill.

To me the most important item in the bill is not the airplanes, but the \$110,000,000 to equip the initial protective force. During our hearings on this bill it has been stated again and again that airplanes will never win a great war. The victory falls to the ground forces. The initial protective force is small and inadequately equipped. The Air Corps is more spectacular than the other branches and too likely to receive undue consideration, so the Congress must keep an adequate check on its development.

This bill was drawn by the War Department and if it passes without the Andrews amendment it will take away from the House for many years to come the salutary effect of hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs which follow requests for authorizations. Thereafter the only check would be the amount the Committee on Appropriations would recommend, based upon the unlimited authorization under 5,500 planes contained in this bill, for any kind of an annual program the Air Corps might sponsor.

I believe we can afford to follow a reasonably slow pace at this time with our air force while authorizing 5,500 planes. A little more money might be spent on the coast defenses. The estimates for the coast defenses were cut \$4,400,000 by the Director of the Budget. Or the money might be spent on artillery and other equipment for our ground forces so they might be able to fight on equal terms against a modern army. We should have learned our lesson from the World War. Gen. Malin Craig testified, as is shown on page 6—

That in the World War General Pershing was forced to procure practically every item of his matériel, except the rifle, from the French and English, and this for an army which did not concentrate on the battlefield until 17 months after the declaration of war.

That is the lesson of 1918. The question is, Shall we profit from it? [Applause.]

Friday night, I heard the commentator, Fulton Lewis, tell of an interview on that day with General Craig. As I heard it, he stated that Germany had more than 90 divisions in her Army, while we have parts of 4 divisions in our Army, and that our men have only 8,000 rifles. I presume he referred to the new and very effective Garand semiautomatic rifle made at the Springfield Armory. The American people should know that more than 2,000,000 rifles left over from the World War, which are in good condition, are immediately available. However, the Garand rifles should be placed in the hands of all our regular soldiers and members of the National Guard at once. The President's program provides for them. Mr. Lewis pointed out that we have a shocking lack of artillery. In the case of a general war on this or any other continent we would be many, many months in putting an effective Army of great size in the field, unless allies like Great Britain and France could again supply our men with matériel.

All of the items in the President's program, except the Army Air Corps, have not required any "build-up." Upon the clear, concise evidence given at the hearings by such of our Army experts as Brigadier General Tyner, Assistant Chief of Staff, and Maj. Gen. C. M. Wesson, Chief of Ordnance, on whom we have every right to rely, I am satisfied that the program as to these items should be fully carried out. Twenty years have elapsed since the last war. The equipment we had then is largely obsolete, or so deteriorated as to be of slight value. Therefore, these items are absolutely necessary insurance premiums on our adequate national-defense policy.

Our national defense has cost this country an average of more than \$1,000,000,000 a year for the past 4 years. For next year it is proposed that we expend more than \$1,600,000,000. Why this enormous increase? With that in mind it behooves us to look carefully at the program of the Army Air Corps and the reasons for it, a program which when it is carried out will require \$230,000,000 annually to maintain.

On page 16 of the report a brief summary of figures which concern Army airplanes is set forth. On December 31, 1938, the Army had 1,797 planes, of which 351 are obsolete. At that time 558 planes were on contract, and under the appropriation bill for 1939-40, 464 more will be ordered, so that on June 30, 1940, the total number of planes on hand, on order, or to be ordered will be 2,468. The Air Corps is completing its present program during the coming year, under which they sought to have 2,320 planes. We are, therefore, starting out with a new program at this time.

By the act of July 2, 1926, the Air Corps was authorized to secure 1,800 planes—page 5 of the report—subject to the provision "that the necessary replacement of airplanes shall not exceed approximately 400 annually." Two thousand three hundred and twenty more planes were authorized under the act of June 24, 1936. Therefore, the number of planes which the Air Corps is authorized to secure at the present moment is 4,120. Without this supplemental program, and without unusual appropriations, the Air Corps expects to have 2,468 planes on June 30, 1940. That will still leave them 1,652 planes in addition to replacements which they can purchase or contract for at once under the present law, which is a far greater number of planes than

they have ever secured in any one year since the World War.

If the authorization is lifted to 5,500 planes and no limitation is placed upon the annual increment, then the Air Corps, if it saw fit, could contract at once for 3,032 more planes in addition to all other planes now under contract, provided they can secure the necessary appropriations. I am willing to accept the opinion of the air chiefs that our program should be extended to 5,500 planes, but I am opposed to giving the Air Corps a blank check of authorization to build the additional planes in any 1 year or at any one time without first explaining to the Military Affairs Committee their reasons for so doing. The House operates on the proposition that the Appropriations Committee shall not legislate, but shall recommend appropriations. Once this bill becomes law the legislative check will have been removed for a great many years from the Air Corps. I believe that check is of vital importance. It was included in the act of 1926, when a limitation of 400 planes in any one year for replacements was set forth. The experts still maintain that our policy should be under a 5-year program, as in 1926. The authorization will have been increased from 1,800 to 5,500 planes under this act. Therefore Mr. ANDREWS by his amendment has raised the limitation to 1,000 planes.

While training planes and bombers may last somewhat longer than 5 years, General Arnold has testified in effect that airplanes built on 1939 specifications and ordered during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, will for the most part be obsolete in 1944. If orders are placed now these planes could not be delivered for 2 years, at the end of which time, due to new inventions, new instruments, new alloys, and new discoveries, some of these planes might well be far inferior to foreign planes of 1941, if not actually obsolete. Therefore the Congress should by law limit the annual increase in the number of planes to prevent any unusual hump in new planes in any one year. Suppose the Air Corps should, on the plea of a great emergency in the world today, secure appropriations for all of these planes and actually have 5,500 planes on hand on June 30, 1941. Suppose that in 1941 some foreign nation again is a menace to the world and through some new invention known not only to them but to us has built an airplane far superior to any of our planes. The Air Corps will be right back with us demanding funds and authorizations for several thousand more planes to meet the 1941 menace. We must therefore go slowly and be ready to apply the brakes on any unnecessary expansion. We should remember that we are not going to stop building when 5,500 planes have been secured. Fifteen percent to twenty percent will have to be replaced each year thereafter, and the maintenance of the Air Corps on a basis of 5,500 planes will be \$230,000,000 annually. Such a burden should be placed on our country only after great deliberation.

One can read the entire hearings without finding any reason whatsoever for undue haste at this time so far as defense of the United States and its possessions are concerned or, for that matter, the defense of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. Unless we are to assume that this expansion from the present authorized strength of 4,120 planes to 5,500 planes is based upon some secret understanding with other powers and is for some purpose other than the adequate defense of territory of the United States and within the Monroe Doctrine, the amendment proposed by Mr. ANDREWS should be adopted in the interest of a sound Army policy.

If this increase is sought for some purpose not brought out in the hearings, the bill should be recommitted in order that further evidence may be submitted in support of the bill as written. We should not act upon a basis of possibilities or probabilities of a great war between nations, other than the United States, unless the House is fully advised of the needs of the Air Corps in the light of the testimony made available to every Member of Congress.

As it would be 3 years before the present 4,120 planes now authorized would be contracted for at the present rate of increase in the Air Corps, I have tried to figure out from the testimony the reason why this section of the bill has been brought up at this time. Three reasons appear:

First. A statement of General Arnold, page 17 of hearings, when asked about doing away with competitive bidding, to the effect that "it is a question of whether you think we have an emergency here confronting us."

Second. In order to maintain as many aircraft-manufacturing plants in production in the United States as possible, the Air Corps should be permitted to place orders for an unusually large number of military craft at this time, without the restriction of competitive bidding.

Third. On the policy of "take it when you can get it," page 17 of report.

Taking up the first reason, I might say that I was surprised that the foreign policy of the United States and the places where our planes might be used in the immediate future were matters not taken up at these hearings. No witness appeared for questioning who was competent to discuss policies. I tried to find out where the airplanes might be used, but without success. The hearings were inaugurated by the presence of Ambassadors Kennedy and Bullitt in a joint meeting with the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Perhaps the world tension which was so marked when they created much publicity, but produced no new information, according to one of the Senators present, will gradually taper off, if not subside. I found it most interesting to read Mr. Kennedy's denial that he had ever predicted a European war just before he sailed for England last Friday. The hearings disclosed that if we get the planes at once we have no air fields on which to base them. Likewise, we have not sufficient personnel to man them, and it will take years in order to train properly the large number of new pilots and mechanics needed for such an expansion of program. Instead of proceeding along in an orderly manner under the present authorized program, this "must program," written by the War Department and not by the committee, is dumped here before us today. Every time we put a plane in the air it is estimated that it will cost \$50,000 a year to keep it there, which is another reason why I think Mr. ANDREWS' amendment should be adopted.

Let us track down this emergency further. These planes presumably are going to fly around the United States and its outlying possessions, or wherever the application of the Monroe Doctrine might take them. Does anyone believe that more than the number of planes we are now authorized to maintain, 4,120, will be required to ward off any attack during the next 3 years on the United States, or, for that matter, on any nation in the Western Hemisphere? If so, the facts have not been presented to the House Military Affairs Committee. If our enemy comes by sea, we would have an additional force of not less than 2,000 Navy planes to supplement the 4,120 Army planes to protect us. In figuring our needs we must not lose sight of the Navy air force, which must be turned aside before the Army planes would see much action from across the Atlantic or the Pacific. The President has recently stated our foreign policy in terms indicating that the United States has not entered into any foreign entanglements. On the evidence we do not need an increase in authorization at this time. To be on the safe side, in view of world conditions, I am willing to vote for authorization for 5,500 planes for the Army. That number, with the Navy air force, will adequately defend the United States. Such a force will not be necessary unless war actually breaks out. Until then the Andrews amendment should be a part of the law.

The second reason for this program, as indicated, is the need to furnish orders to airplane plants now idle, without competitive bids. Not a single manufacturer or representative of the aircraft industry appeared as a witness. No comprehensive figures concerning the industry were presented, merely the names of five companies which are not particularly active. From one who should know, however, Leighton W. Rogers, president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, a statement appeared in the New York Times following the President's message. I have quoted from it above.

Certainly, on the basis of recent large orders placed by foreign governments, the conditions of the industry as a whole are bound to improve this year. To allow the Air

Corps to ignore the present law, which requires Government aircraft to be purchased on competitive bidding, would be to open the way once again to scandal and to raids upon the Public Treasury. Surprising as it may seem, some of the planes cost up to \$600,000, the initial planes in particular classes. To award a contract for a plane at a cost of \$200,000 to a company which was idle, when another company which was in full operation would build that plane for \$175,000, would open up again the old question of subsidies. Anyone who reads the testimony will be satisfied that no sufficient evidence has been produced to warrant any change now in the present law.

The real purpose for bringing forward the first section of this bill at this time is, in my opinion, based largely upon the third reason, "Take it when you can get it." Let us give the Air Corps the \$50,000,000 recommended by the President for the purpose of placing immediate orders for new airplanes. Then let us stop, look, and listen. Let us not be parties to any further unusual increase in our annual Budget just because some Army officials may believe that the American people have already become tired of reckless and wasteful spending, and that succeeding Presidents and Congresses will not be so easy to handle as the Seventy-sixth Congress. General Arnold testified that "in drawing up this program—for the Air Corps—there was just enough pie there to go around." Another general stated that the idea was to "take it when you can get it." In other words, there is no sound reason behind the War Department's demand that the Air Corps be given another blank check on the United States Treasury, free from congressional restraint.

I believe that it is the duty of each Congressman to see that this program, if adopted, is carried out properly and reasonably, both in the number of planes ordered in any one year and in the amount of money expended. For that reason, I feel that we should support the Andrews amendment, which would require that the Air Corps is to be limited to not more than 1,000 airplanes during any one fiscal year after June 30, 1940, except in the event of the declaration of a national emergency or by a further act of Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I first wish to call attention to a statement that has been made on the floor of this House once today and once a few days ago by my good friends and fellow colleagues on the Committee on Military Affairs the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], who seem to be rather perturbed because Assistant Secretary of War Louis Johnson did not appear before the Committee on Military Affairs on this bill. Assistant Secretary of War Johnson happens to be a distinguished constituent from my district. He is a past national commander of the American Legion and an officer of the World War with a distinguished-service record. I know personally that Assistant Secretary Johnson was not invited by the committee to appear before it, and if these gentlemen had wanted him at any time and had extended an invitation to him he would have been there to answer any inquiries they might have cared to put to him.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?  
Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. I may say that the minority on the committee on three occasions asked the chairman of the committee to invite Mr. Johnson to come before us.

Mr. EDMISTON. I know nothing of the request of the minority to the chairman. I do know The Assistant Secretary would have been glad to come if he had been asked.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAY. I may say in response to the remark of the gentleman from New York that the matter was mentioned a time or two, but no formal request was made to have Mr. Johnson come before the committee. The reason he was not called is that he is to be called later in connection with another bill which is to be considered by the Committee on

Military Affairs. At that time, if the gentleman wishes to find out from Mr. Johnson anything pertinent to the pending legislation, he can ask him about it.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to one provision in the bill. The language beginning at the bottom of page 5 after the "Provided further," and extending on page 6 down to and including line 13 is an amendment I offered in committee which was adopted by the committee. I shall not take time to read the language, but the effect of the amendment is to place all officers whether under the classification of Reserve, National Guard, Regular Army, or any other classification, on the same basis as to pensions, compensation, and retirement pay as officers of the Regular Army, if and when called into extended duty, and that is defined in the amendment as 30 days or more of service. The Navy and Marine Corps in the World War made no distinction between Regular officers and any other officers serving with their forces. The Army always has made a distinction. I believe this provision is a very just and fair inclusion in this bill.

Under the provisions of this bill, 3,000 Reserve Corps officers may be called into active duty. If these officers are called into active duty and are performing the same duty as Regular Army officers, they should be accorded under all circumstances the same treatment as their fellow officers. If two Air Corps officers are flying in the same ship and that ship happens to crash and they are injured to the same extent or killed in that crash, there should be no distinction between the Regular Army officer and the Reserve officer when both of them are performing the same duty under identical circumstances.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. I believe that under section 3 of the bill, at the bottom of page 3, you do not grant benefits to a student who is injured.

Mr. EDMISTON. May I explain to the gentleman why that is. These students are not in the Army. They are attending air schools operated by private individuals, to which the Government may lend officers or enlisted men as instructors. However, those students are in no way under the control of the Service or in it while attending school. After completing the course of instruction at such school and then going to Randolph Field these men are in the Army, and under this amendment would be on a par with all other cadets, or enlisted men.

Mr. MILLER. Does not the gentleman believe it would be better to have all the training under the direct control of the Army?

Mr. EDMISTON. That would be a matter of opinion. This bill does not make such provision. The students must finish a course of instruction in one of these schools to get into Randolph Field.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, a distinguished member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Is there not a provision in the bill that these students will be taken in under existing authorization as flying cadets and will go to the civilian schools as flying cadets who are detailed to the civilian schools under the amendment to existing law which allows the detail of a small portion of the enlisted and officer personnel today? So they will have the status of an enlisted man as a flying cadet, although their pay status is somewhat different, their status is that of an enlisted man, but they enlist as a flying cadet and will be detailed to these civilian schools for instruction and they will be on an Army status or an enlisted status as flying cadets at that time, as I understand the present plan which is contemplated in this bill.

Mr. EDMISTON. My understanding is different from that of my colleague from Connecticut with respect to their status

in that until they finish at the school they are not in the military service.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Under section 2 of the bill, when the Army facilities for instruction and training are deemed by the Secretary to be insufficient, he may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, detail personnel of the Regular Army as students. It is my understanding that this includes the students in the civilian flying schools and that they are first enlisted in the Army as flying cadets, which is an enlisted status, and then detailed under section 2 of this bill.

Mr. EDMISTON. I think the gentleman is perhaps correct and I missed that thought in reading the bill.

Mr. MILLER. If that is so, and they are enlisted men assigned as flying cadets, why should they be exempt or why should their widows or dependents be exempt from any benefits that may now be available to any other enlisted man?

Mr. EDMISTON. I do not think they should be.

Mr. MILLER. Does not the gentleman notice, as he turns the page of the bill there, that their dependents are entitled to no benefits in case of injury or death?

Mr. EDMISTON. I will check that when I have the time. I missed the connection there, but if that is true, I am sorry it is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, who is always interested in protecting the interests of her Reserve and National Guard constituents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that this has been done before? Some years ago provisions were made by law that would take care of the Reserve pilots who were killed or injured.

Mr. EDMISTON. What the gentlewoman from Massachusetts refers to, I presume, is that when we passed the bill providing for the cancelation of air-mail contracts and called Reserve Air Corps officers into flying the mail we provided in that act that they should be treated in all respects the same as Regular Army officers performing the same duty. So this is not a new idea, particularly for hazardous service.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman agrees, of course, that the provision which he has been discussing was placed in the bill by an amendment of the committee without any hearings whatsoever on that subject; and the gentleman also knows, as a matter of fact, there was an additional bill—H. R. 3220—to take care of this subject. Does the gentleman know the millions of dollars of additional cost of putting in this amendment?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EDMISTON. I will be pleased to answer the gentleman if he will yield me 2 more minutes.

Mr. MAY. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. EDMISTON. No one can estimate what the cost of this will be, because no one can foresee how many of these Reserve and National Guard officers may be cracked up or killed. The cost will be proportionate to how many are injured or killed; and regardless of what it costs, if we injure or kill these American boys while performing a patriotic duty, in my opinion, they should all be on the same basis and should all be treated alike. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this legislation. It is good legislation and it has been based on testimony, good common-sense testimony given by our Chief of Staff and other high Army officers who have refused to become alarmed by certain stories that have been brought back here from Europe by some of our foreign envoys. At the outset I want to say that I believe one of the cheapest and best ways to promote peace and to adequately defend our Nation would be for us in Congress to find some way to padlock the lips of some of our war-

mongering Cabinet officers and prevent them from going around the country making very inflammatory remarks and inviting trouble. [Applause.]

There is no reason on earth for the Congress or the Nation to be frightened into a frantic expansion of our national defense by the stories we hear about the imminence of war and the inevitability of our being drawn into it.

After listening to testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee it appears highly significant that the alarmist attitude of our foreign envoys—Mr. Bullitt and Mr. Kennedy—does not agree with the attitude of Gen. Malin Craig, our Chief of Staff, and other high Army officers who have testified at the hearings.

It seems to me that we should give due consideration to the fact that not only are these military authorities just as concerned with adequate defense for this country as anybody could be, but they are in a better position to know the requirements of that defense than anybody else possibly could be. It is their business. They are trained in these matters. And it cannot be denied that our military and naval agencies of intelligence and information are equal to any in the world. These men who are educated and experienced in the business of protecting the United States and advising the Congress in the requirements for defense, regard this whole question with a dispassionate and unemotional attitude which is exceedingly important in a time like this. I have yet to hear one of them say that an emergency exists.

Even so, if this were the first emergency, or the first crisis that we have ever faced in this country in the past 6 years, then there might be some reason for our becoming so alarmed as to engage in a frantic expansion of our national defense and the building of thousands of airplanes, and the neglect of all considerations of upkeep after the defense mechanism is created. But the fact is emergencies and crises have become about the commonest things in America in the last 6 years. Every time the administration wants a bill passed in Congress it reaches into its well-stocked cupboard of emergencies and crises and drags out a couple. Then for a time they make the headlines on the first pages of newspapers, only to evaporate, one after another, after the measures have been passed or defeated, as the case may be.

So, then, this is just another case of crying "wolf"—and "wolf" has been cried out too many times for us to regard the alarm too seriously.

#### BEST METHOD

There is no doubt that there are certain requirements necessary to bring our national defense up to that state of efficiency and capacity which would provide the insurance that we ought always to maintain against any possible contingencies of the future. I, for one, however, am wholly inclined to go along with the cool, dispassionate, and thoroughly-considered views of the military officials and not the alarmist views of our foreign envoys, who come back here saturated with the psychology of Europe and with their hides filled with the talk of the imminence of war, and who are sent up here on Capitol Hill by the administration as high-pressure salesmen to scare the Congress into what may well be a wholly extravagant and unnecessary expansion of the national defense.

We have to keep in mind also the standpoint of the taxpayer—who, apparently, has become the forgotten man—that the first cost of national defense is not the big cost. It is the upkeep that hurts the taxpayers over the years.

Of course, the Panama Canal should be made impregnable, if it is possible to do so. We should neglect no single feature of our national defense that our Army officials regard as vitally necessary. And we should continue our policy of the Monroe Doctrine. But we should do it, not in a state of hysteria or frenzy, but in a state of cool, calm sanity that will not lead us to make mistakes which might easily precipitate, rather than avoid, a world war.

I think we may well recognize the fact that when our Ambassadors, Messrs. Bullitt, and Kennedy, and others, come

back home bearing tales of terrors and messages of alarm, none of them, and nobody else, knows what is in the mind of Adolph Hitler or Benito Mussolini, or other rulers of Europe. Nobody knows whether they mean to make war next spring, or whether they mean to make another bluff. Nobody knows what they intend to do.

We cannot, in a year or two, try to create a defense which will anticipate any possible eventuality that might take place in the world, because we have seen realignments occur since the last year and we will see realignments occur again. Do not forget that in the last World War Italy was pitted against Germany. Today she is an ally of Germany.

This question of a united front for democracies, still a very ardent one to which we are devoted in this country, might turn out to be one to which some foreign nations might not be so devoted. Politics plays a great part in the affairs of the Old World. Their diplomacy has no conception of open covenants, openly arrived at. We must keep all of these things in mind when we begin to expand our defense mechanism.

We have been told—and I believe it—that no foreign government possesses bombing planes that can go farther than 800 or 900 miles, drop their bombs, and return to their home bases. The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are still somewhat more than 800 or 900 miles wide.

Lincoln once said that the nations of Europe, with all the treasure of the world except ours and with Napoleon Bonaparte for a leader, could not take a drink of water from the Ohio or make a track in the Blue Ridge in a thousand years. Mr. Lincoln may not have envisioned all of the modern methods of transportation such as airplanes, but I am inclined to think that his statement still stands. Who is there who believes that any nation or any combination of nations in Europe could subdue or subjugate this country with airplanes? They might, of course, damage some of our coastal cities, but even that is a remote possibility which we would want to avoid. They might actually demolish some of our outlying territories, which we would want to avoid if possible. But we must remember at all times during these stressful days that there is a vast difference between a defense that is within a couple of hundred miles of its home shores and an offense that has to cross stormy oceans and maintain a line of communication in order to operate in a foreign country. We had a taste of some of those difficulties during the last Great War.

So, then, I hope we will keep our feet on the ground and our heads out of the clouds of fear while we are considering this problem of national defense.

Now, as to the question of how rapidly we should build the aircraft provided for in this legislation. The logical view which seems to be held by our military and naval authorities, as well as others, is that it is more important for us to have the facilities by which to turn rapidly to adequate volume production of airplanes when they are needed rather than build up a vast supply of airplanes to become obsolete before they are needed. For that reason I find myself constrained to support the amendment, which, I understand, will be offered tomorrow to provide that the airplanes authorized in this act shall be built at a rate of not more than 1,000 per year.

The question arises at this point as to whether or not, if we are to continue to do it, we can provide the democratic countries of Europe the quantities of planes they need and actually build as many as 1,000 planes a year for ourselves. In any event, we have been told that the construction of these planes for England and France will rapidly build up our manufacturing capacity to the point where we will be able to go into mass production very quickly if the emergency arises. We are also told that England and France are going to pay for the mistakes, engineering and otherwise, which will be made in building up this airplane-manufacturing capacity.

I am not sure as to the ethics of letting our friends, the overseas democracies, pay for our mistakes, but the administration seems to think it is both ethical and good business. At any rate, I shall not be willing to vote for the construction

of more than 1,000 airplanes per year until the general staffs of the Army and Navy tell the Congress that a production above that is a vital necessity.

To what extent the administration is using this so-called emergency of national defense to cover up the failures of the New Deal on the economic front at home is open to debate. There is nothing new to the political device of distracting public attention from one's failures by directing that attention to distant horizons. It is the oldest technique in politics, but in the case of our national defense it would be an extremely costly technique so far as the taxpayers are concerned, because of the necessary upkeep of the defense mechanism after it is created.

The President himself has said in times past, and it is true, that any temporary prosperity based upon war activities would be the most disastrous mistake that this country could make. We do not have to take the President's word for it either. Look at our experience after the last war. This Nation is now paying, and will continue to pay for the next 100 years, for the folly of having thought it had emerged into new levels of prosperity by reason of the activities of the last war. Another war will be destructive and horrible beyond conception. It will be vastly worse than the last war. I think I am safe in saying that there is not an economist or statesman worthy of the name who does not realize today and say that the aftermath of another war would bring such a depression in the United States as to make the one in which we have been struggling for 9 years look like a wave of prosperity.

The whole history of the United States, as shown by economic charts, is that after every war and the boom accompanying such a war, there was a descent into a depression. I say that, without exception, this is the history of this Nation. It would be so after the next war. It is also true that over a history of 150 years every depression following every war has been deeper than the preceding depression following the preceding war, and the depression following the World War is far greater than ever before was experienced in the world.

Now, if we are to profit at all by the history and experience of the past, then we must anticipate that another war would throw us into a depression the depths of which we cannot even conceive. That would mean in this country, in all probability, such a confusion and disintegration of national unity as to make probable some form of fascism or communism or other form of dictatorial government.

The old rallying cry of Bunker Hill is still a good motto for us: "Keep your powder dry and don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes." [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, of all the bills that will come before this Congress providing for our national defense, this one is the least objectionable. The main purpose of the bill is to increase the air forces of the Nation from 2,468 ships to 5,500 ships, and properly train officers to handle them. In addition to this, the bill provides \$110,000,000 for procurement of new equipment for the modernization of available equipment for the existing units of the Regular Army and the National Guard. The 3,032 planes are to cost \$170,000,000 or approximately \$56,000 for each plane.

Here in the National Capital there seems to be increasing fear that some country, somewhere, is about to land an army here and lead us all away as slaves to waiting ships. Candidly, I do not know of a single nation that has any idea of making war upon us. If we attend to our own business, no one will make war on us. If we allow England and France to inveigle us into defending them on the theory that a sister democracy should defend a democracy, we may have trouble with the enemies of England and France. My answer to this propaganda of defending the democracies of England and France is that neither one of them is a democracy. How a hereditary monarchy like England can be called a democracy is a contradiction of history. How France, where the people do not elect their congressmen, can be

called a democracy is another contradiction. There is not the slightest reason on earth why we should be concerned with the so-called democracies of England and France. Since the last war these two countries have made no honest attempt to pay us the money we loaned them. If we were to collect that money today, without interest, we would have close to \$8,000,000,000; and if we could collect at the same rate of interest which the farmers are forced to pay in the United States, the debt due us from England and France would amount to \$18,000,000,000. That is what we received in the World War for our interest "in democracies."

The chairman of this committee has just told you that we should increase our national defense to compare favorably with the defense provided by England. That is absolutely no argument. England in itself means nothing in territory, but the British Empire is quite another thing. The sun never sets on British soil. England is a nation beyond the seas. She needs a navy and a well-equipped war machine because of her great extensive empire. As a nation she is leading a precarious existence in the defense of her dominions. She would never be able to defend them unless she edged her way into help from other nations. She did that in the World War with this country. It was easy for her to accomplish that purpose because she controlled our markets of wheat and cotton and was then, as she is now, our financial adviser. There is absolutely no question today but what England has had more to do with drumming up a war scare in this country than any other contributing factor.

A reasonable outlay for air defenses of the modern type is proper, but this program looks like a preparation for war. We do not know whom we are going to fight. We do not need to know that, yet England will tell us in due time.

We are afraid some nation will land an army here. We should stop and realize that the enemy of this great democracy has already landed an army here more dangerous to our existence than the armies of the combined nations of the world—the army of the unemployed. This Congress will not appropriate money enough to feed this great army. The Congress reduced the absolutely necessary amount for this purpose in the sum of \$150,000,000, and all of the conservative elements among the Democrats and Republicans supported this cut. But today, when someone brings up this war scare, we find these same conservative elements among the Democrats and Republicans embracing each other in the aisles of Congress in their combined eagerness to defend this country. Patriotism never flows faster in the veins of these patriots than when someone objects to building more national armies here until we first feed the army of the unemployed.

The worst side of the whole picture is that unemployment will increase and not decrease as long as we allow this private enterprise of interest clipping to continue by the private control of the money that belongs to all the people. How absolutely foolish and absurd it is to talk of national defense when the same Government that desires to be defending is foreclosing in a wholesale manner on thousands and thousands of our home owners daily. How foolish to appropriate money for national defense when we have over 60,000,000 of our population in distress.

My advice is, and I am as patriotic as any man in this House, or any man who ever sat in this House, to take the load of debt off the backs of our own people and open up an opportunity for them to work for themselves and their families. Let them have a home to defend and they will defend it. Let us put our own house in order first and that is the only road to a sound national defense. If war came today we would have more trouble feeding the people behind the lines of battle than we would those engaged in it. We are not ready for war and we will not be ready until we give our own people a chance to enjoy what this Government promised them—and the only purpose for which this Government was formed—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We are capable of bringing these blessings to all our people, but we shall never accomplish this much-prayed for existence until we stop a few individuals from grabbing all while the many suffer.

The patriots here in Congress deplore the fact that there are Communists in the United States. Of course there are Communists here—Communists always appear when there is a diseased government. When they appear we ought to know that something is wrong in the way we are operating this Government. Our job is not to chase down Communists but to correct the mistakes of government. Pain is a good thing for the patient and the doctor. Pain tells where the trouble is. The pain can be relieved by any skillful doctor of medicine, but the organic disease will continue. We had better understand our pathological condition and go to the source of the trouble in this Government and cure it. Let the people live as our forefathers planned, and all the "isms" will disappear.

My philosophy is, protect the people of the United States now when they need protection, and if, some time, war is brought to our shores, these same people will protect the Government. Make the great mass of the people of the United States understand in their hearts that we have a country worth defending, and our ingenuity, our resources, our manpower, our inventive genius, and patriotism for a land we love will defend this Nation, located as it is, against the combined forces of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to seem to be going into ancient history, but I do feel warranted in this discussion of the expansion of our air program in reading a somewhat prophetic contribution which I made to this discussion nearly a year ago in connection with the discussion of our naval program. With the permission of the Committee, I should like to read those words into the RECORD now, as it seems to me they very forcibly call to our attention—and did even a year ago—the imperative necessity of expanding our air forces. This is found in the report of the Naval Affairs Committee submitted to the Congress on March 7, 1938, on our defense plans. In the course of an expression of the views of certain members of the committee we asked, "Why limit our aircraft?" and then went on as follows:

#### WHY LIMIT OUR AIRCRAFT?

The evidence before our committee emphasized the extreme flexibility of aircraft in the defense of the American continent where aircraft can be available in either ocean within 24 hours.

The Congress may also most profitably read the evidence before the committee as to the amazing advances in aircraft even in the past 2 years since the Inskip report was published. Each day witnesses new achievements by aircraft.

The disconcerting aspect of the proposed legislation in regard to aircraft is its imposition for the first time of a limit on the number of aircraft the Navy may possess.

Insofar as aircraft are concerned, this legislation limits the existing authorization.

Under the Vinson-Trammell Act it is provided that "the President is hereby authorized to procure the necessary naval aircraft for vessels and other naval purposes in numbers commensurate with a treaty navy."

The Navy decided that this meant 2,050 planes, but this limit rested solely in Executive discretion and could be altered at will.

The authorization was unlimited so far as Congress or treaty was concerned.

The proposed legislation now, for the first time, imposes a limit of 3,000.

Yet England has just presented an air program providing 12,000 planes and placed air defenses on a parity with the Army and the Navy in the amount of the appropriations. This is in startling contrast to the American allocation, although America seems ideally adapted to emphasize air defense.

I concluded:

This bill limits aircraft when the importance of aircraft for defense is increasing with revolutionary rapidity and other nations are spending 10 times what we are for experimentation in aircraft development for defense.

This paragraph is now incorporated for emphasis on the words that called the attention of Congress to this situation nearly 1 year ago.

As a result of that protest the limitation was stricken out of the naval bill on the floor after the limitation had been submitted by the Navy Department and approved by the Naval Affairs Committee.

Two thousand new planes for the Army this year, in addition to those now authorized and provided for the Navy,

and 1,000 more in each of the next 2 years for the Army, in addition to what the Navy may require, are sufficient to expand American plane production to a most gratifying extent.

Any idle plant facilities will certainly be fully occupied, and both plants and personnel will be expanded to meet the requirements, civilian and military, at home and abroad.

Having lagged too long behind, it is well that now we should not go to the other extreme and produce in a single year planes that will be soon and uniformly obsolescent and planes for which, according to General Arnold, of the Air Corps, there will be no trained-pilot personnel.

This explains my sympathy with the Wadsworth-Andrews amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the chief issue over this bill—and it seems to me it is—is whether the War Department shall build 3,000 planes in something like 2 years or less, or shall spread the program out over 3 years, it is a very happy situation in the House with respect to the national defense; and if the War Department builds these 3,000 planes within 3 years, it will be a very happy situation for the national defense in the country, because that will be just exactly 3,000 more combat planes than we had in France at the end of the World War, and the same thing was true of artillery and about all our fighting equipment. This was characteristic of the American people.

The American people are not war-minded. Their whole record shows this. As soon as a war ends they demobilize and throw away their arms and uniforms and go back to the pursuits of civil life. There is no danger of making the American people military-minded. The difficulty is to keep them sufficiently military-minded to maintain an adequate national defense.

The American people are not imperial-minded. They dream of no world empire. Any other nation but this would now own Cuba. Any other nation but this would keep the Philippines. This was the only Nation that returned to China its share of the Boxer indemnity. We are the only Nation which refused mandates out of the World War. Instances could be multiplied. There is no country on the American continent or beyond the continent that can honestly say that it fears that the United States covets a foot of its territory.

American lack of military and imperial ambition is basic in our national lives. It has marked our whole history as a people. It is the national philosophy. But this philosophy, fortified by our geographic isolation from the other great nations of the world, appears to have built up an attitude regarding the national defense which is no longer justified in the light of revolutionary changes in transportation and communication and in weapons of war, which bring the whole world to the doorstep of every nation.

I recall once standing on this floor advocating the expansion of the Navy, but not of the Army, on the ground that any war in which we might engage would be fought on the high seas; that no other nation could undertake to invade this Nation, and that this Nation would undertake to invade no other nation. Six years later we had an Army of 2,000,000 men in France and 2,000,000 more in course of preparation.

A controversy has been raging over an alleged private remark of the President that the frontier of America is on the Rhine. Whether he said it or not, the frontier of America has been on the Rhine, and beyond. An American Army has trod the soil of Germany. The American frontier has been on the coasts of Europe, of Africa, and of Asia, when those coasts were vastly more distant from ours than they are today. We have had naval engagements on all those coasts.

The overwhelming majority of Americans now agree that we should build up and maintain an adequate national defense, but when it comes to blueprinting that proposition we are as far apart as the poles. A retired major general of Marines visited Colorado last fall and in discussing the national defense said, in so many words, to applauding audi-

ences, that we ought to have a Navy which we could let out on ropes during the day and haul in at night. It is well nigh unbelievable. There is some of that attitude in Congress. It was in evidence in speeches on the Ludlow war referendum resolution and the naval program of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

The controversy wages around what constitutes a defensive navy. Some gentlemen would draw imaginary lines in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans and say that we want a Navy which is capable of defending us behind those lines, and no farther. They want a Navy that can defend us at Honolulu on the west and Puerto Rico on the east. If we build a Navy capable of fighting beyond these imaginary lines it is a Navy for offense, for aggressive action against other nations. Such views would be funny if it were not for the fact that they are expressed by national representatives supposed to be capable of sound judgment on questions vital to the safety of this Nation, and having a vote on these questions.

Perhaps long adherence to a viewpoint is calculated to cause one to give it undue weight, but it has always been my viewpoint that a navy which is not capable of taking the offensive is not capable of maintaining the defensive. It is my viewpoint that a navy adequate to the defense of the United States—and that means the defense of the continent of America—is a navy able to go wherever the water is deep enough to float it. Any lesser navy would be a provocation to war, not an insurance against it.

There is no sure way to avoid war. But the surest way is to be so ready that the other fellow cannot start. Nothing would be so dangerous to the peace and security of our country as a belief on the part of war-minded nations that we were not ready and were not willing to take any measures whatsoever requisite to preserve the sovereignty, the integrity, and the peace of America.

It has always been my conviction that the thought in the mind of the German high command that this country would not and could not enter the World War on the side of the Allies, their contempt openly expressed for our military ability, was responsible for the ruthless conduct which forced us into that war. I have hoped that the tremendous achievement of this country in the World War would serve as a permanent reminder to war-minded nations that this country is willing and able to fight; but if the World War taught the world anything, apparently it has been forgotten, and today there are marked trends in world affairs of which we must take cognizance and against which we must prepare. It would be the height of national folly to disregard these developments and their possibilities as they may affect us.

The slogan invented by Wilson "to make the world safe for democracy" was an inspiration of genius which welded the world together against the Germanic allies, but I know in the bottom of my heart that at the back of this since much-criticized slogan was the purpose to make the world safe for the United States. I felt then what I hardly dared say, that unless the United States stopped Germany in France we would some day have to stop her in South America. It seems less wild now that we still may have to do that. The surest way not to have to do it is to be ready to stop it.

I shall be agreeably disappointed if the final outcome of the Spanish war does not advance the frontiers of Germany and Italy toward the continent of America. I greatly fear that the satisfaction of those who have favored the Fascist rebellion in Spain will be short-lived. I cannot envision the Fascist dictators turning Spain over to France and England, or relinquishing the military advantages won by Fascist blood and money in Spain. They are on the march and they must continue.

There are other eventualities in the making on the map of the world which behoove us to be prepared. They are in the Pacific. It is as certain as sunrise that when Japan has completed her program on the Asiatic mainland and consolidated her gains and gotten under her control the material resources, she will face the question mark overhanging the Pacific. Now we are in a controversy over the suggested fortification of Guam. I am not ready with the answer.

I am ready, however, to say that it must be fortified soon or abandoned later.

If we could draw that imaginary line in the Pacific from the tip of the Aleutian Islands to Australia, and get an unbreakable guaranty that the line would stay there for even 30 years, I would be willing to relinquish what is on the other side of it. But if anything has been proved in the last 30 years it is that international guaranties are absolutely worthless; the neutrality of Belgium was worthless; the Nine Power Pact was worthless; the Washington naval disarmament agreement was worthless, the agreement, in the execution of which, as Will Rogers aptly said, "We sunk our ships and England sunk her blueprints."

There is no assurance whatever in treaties of peace, and there is none in neutrality acts. We have passed three neutrality acts in the past 4 years, and all of them not only unworkable, but dangerous. We have found that you cannot blueprint a future course of international conduct today and have it fit the picture tomorrow.

International friendship is a diplomatic myth. It shatters under very slight provocation. We are not blameless. If it is even suspected that the President is making a gesture of friendship to the democracies of England and France against the fascist dictators of Europe, the outcry goes over the land, in the language of the late Herbert Hoover, that "the President is leading the country down the road to war."

We have chosen a policy of isolation and we must be able to defend it against the world. It has been well said that neutrality is a good thing if you are able to defend it. We need a stronger defense than if we had an alliance with England and France: A Navy and an air force equal to the best, with a margin of safety in case of doubt; a military establishment such as is contemplated in the pending legislation; arms and munition plants capable of rapid expansion to large production; and constant research in the field of improvement in arms and munitions.

Some opponents of such a program here on Capitol Hill say we already have such an establishment. I hope they are right. Unfortunately for me, some of the gentlemen here on the Hill who specialize on foreign policy and the national defense are peculiarly unconvincing. There is a marked note of unsoundness running through everything they say. The more they talk the more I thank God they are not in a position to do anything else.

Two Members of this body who are very vocal along these lines, as recently as last October proposed to impeach the President for his failure to enforce the Neutrality Act and lay an embargo against Japan, notwithstanding all the other signatories to the nine-power pact under which Japan guaranteed the inviolability of China, were refusing to act. To my ears, their views on the national defense and foreign policy are as "tinkling cymbals and sounding brass." They do, however, serve to muddle the mind of the country, and make more difficult the great responsibilities devolving on the President. It is reassuring to note that the press, regardless of politics, is criticizing them and supporting the administration.

Democracies are at one great disadvantage as compared with dictatorships. Democracies have no secrets. They have to conduct their business touching the national defense and foreign policy on the town-hall plan, with an international hook-up. It is demanded that the President and the Secretary of State come up to Congress and tell the world just what they are doing, and why. A whisper in Washington echoes in Berlin and Tokyo the same day. Perhaps it makes little difference whether state secrets are spilled at open hearings or relayed from congressional committee rooms. There is one secret I hope they will all ultimately possess fully, the secret that we are ready, willing, and able.

If we are asked where we are going to get the money for a great armament program, there are two answers: One is, we are still the richest Nation on earth, with a superabundance of everything. The other is, money is not necessary. Three comparatively small, impoverished nations, with meager natural resources, are remaking the map of the

world. There is an aspect of Germany worth considering. Ten years ago she was prostrate and helpless. Today Germany is the most feared power in Europe, with Hitler building a greater empire than Bismarck. So let us not worry too much about the cost.

My ideas of foreign policy are sketchy and changeable, although I would prefer an axis of democracies against the dictatorships. My ideas about neutrality acts are about as muddled as the acts themselves, but I am consoled by the reflection that if I could write a perfect law it would not work either. But in one field I am disturbed by no doubt whatever. In five Congresses I have voted for every dollar carried in every bill for the national defense and I shall do so in this Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just preceded me mentioned the situation we were in at the time of the last war in regard to equipment in France, and I think that brings up perhaps the most important part of this whole program. It is not a spectacular part of our program, such as the air-defense part of it, but it is something that is essential to preparedness, and that is the furnishing of the equipment for our troops. In this program the Army has laid out a proposition to furnish equipment for what they call the initial protective force, the force that they would call upon first to defend this country if attacked.

That force is nothing more nor less than the present standing Regular Army and National Guard, augmented to some degree by the Regular Army Enlisted Reserve. It would amount to a total of some 400,000 men, when we have in the Enlisted Reserve the total number which we expect, over the period of the next 3 or 4 years. At the present time it would not reach 400,000 men, but we hope to get it up to that figure. It is the peacetime standing Army and National Guard of the country. Today we are very deficient in weapons and in ammunition merely for that force. We do not have modern rifles; we do not have sufficient ammunition even for war-time rifles and artillery for that force itself.

In this program—although not included in this bill, because the present authorizations will allow its manufacture if we furnish the funds this year, but in this year's extraordinary national-defense program—we provide \$110,000,000 to bring up to a better condition the ammunition and weapons of that initial protective force of our Regular Army and the National Guard. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] said, I think that is about the most important, although not the most spectacular, part of this program. That will not furnish those 400,000 men the necessary equipment and ammunition to carry them over until we can start bringing in ammunition in quantity, if they are engaged in war, under our present set-up. It would take about \$430,000,000 to properly equip that force of 400,000 men. With \$110,000,000 we can furnish some of the most important items, however, such as the semiautomatic rifles, modernization of the artillery, and completion of most of our antiaircraft regiments.

There is another program which we entered into last year, for which we carry \$32,500,000 additional authorization in this bill, which will go a long way toward making it possible for us to produce, if we should be in war or a national emergency, the ammunition and equipment to furnish this initial protective force and the troops which follow it with ammunition and equipment, as I have said. That is the educational orders program. It takes a long while to manufacture those items of military equipment. Most of them are not manufactured in peacetime on any commercial basis. Even those which were turned out in great quantities during the World War cannot be made now, because in most cases the tools have been destroyed, in some cases the plants have gone out of business, and in all cases the men who made them have largely gone out of the industry today. So that it takes anywhere from 4 to 18 months, on the average, to tool a plant to start to get into production of these war munitions. Even with regard to the smaller munitions, such

as ordinary steel shells, it takes a long time to get the plants tooled and actually into production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Last year we entered into a program to place small orders with commercial plants to allow them to tool-up to turn out munitions in peacetime. We did not do that to furnish any physical reserve of those munitions. The peacetime production of munitions is still in our arsenals, but we wanted to equip private plants with the machinery and with the experience, so that in case of war they could go into production after a reasonable length of time, so that we would not be held up as we were during the World War, 17 or 18 months, before we could get into production.

In this program we included 55 critical items—items which the War Department considers absolutely necessary. The program of educational orders, of training the industry, will cut down the time it will take to get these items in quantity on an average about 8 months. It will run from 4 months' saving in time on some items to 11 months on others, and the average saving will be about 8 months. We know from experience that actually we are not going to build up a great physical reserve of munitions which we will need in case of war. We do not appropriate the money to do that.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wish the gentleman would explain to the membership of the committee just the difficulty that the evidence disclosed was encountered in the matter of providing the necessary tools and implements, and whether or not there are probably two or three thousand different kinds in some different machines necessary to the manufacture of certain parts of munitions.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Many of these items are complicated and difficult to manufacture and require a great many aids to manufacture. The 50-caliber machine gun, for instance, requires some 4,500 different tools, jigs, dies, and fixtures to set up one production line for the production of that one instrument. It is not the most complicated, but it is one that we need in time of war, and one which our arsenals cannot turn out in large quantities. It would take many months to make those tools to set up a production line in any private industry.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The provision in the bill providing for educational orders deals with products that are entirely noncommercial in their nature and which do not go on the commercial market at all.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. That is entirely true. The noncommercial nature of the items is the thing which makes it impossible to secure them on short notice in case of emergency. We need some such preparation.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Does this bill provide, as part of our preparation, for laying up a further stock pile of critical materials such, for instance, as manganese?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. This bill does not provide for any such stock-pile reserve. I believe the regular War Department appropriation bill will carry an item providing for part of the necessary stock pile of some of these items.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. For the last 2 years the Navy Department bills have provided for such stock piles.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. But they have been very inadequate.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that it might be well to provide for the production of this critical material within our own country, as a further safeguard?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. In those cases and where it can be done at a fairly reasonable cost and where the quantity would be adequate to be of value to us in case of emergency.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am told that I introduced the first educational-order bill that was ever introduced in Congress. At that time I was told that unless these jigs and dies, and so forth, were made and the work kept up we would lose the men skilled in such fine machine work and that in a short time it would be impossible to make them without long delay because of the absence of skilled workmen.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Although there are many machine-tool men out of work today, it is true that war-time needs would create a great and serious shortage of that type of skilled workmen. The War Department has been seeking to inaugurate such a program ever since the World War, and we finally started on it last year. As I say, \$32,500,000 additional authorization for educational orders is carried in this bill and will cover some 55 critical items. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak a few words on behalf of the aeromechanic, who will become a very important factor under this bill.

The aeromechanic is not trained in a day or two; he is a man who has arrived at his position in the airplane industry through long training and experience. It has been found that those who enter the airplane industry from other types of production parallel to it, such as the automobile industry, do not readily grasp the methods of production in the manufacture of planes. If we conduct this program in such a way that at one time there is large production and at another time small production, we shall vitally affect the welfare of these mechanics. I believe the thing to do is to adopt the program of constant airplane production proposed by the minority so that the mechanics may be well trained and continue in the industry rather than float off in other directions.

Another subject I would like to mention and bring to the attention of all those present is that one of the most important items of national defense is a smooth-running, prosperous industry and commerce all over the United States. This, I believe, is the very foundation of a true national defense. Secondly, we discovered in the World War that probably the first line of national defense was our agriculture. This is not the time to go into this subject, but I hope that in considering the legislation now before us, and bearing in mind throughout the session the needs of national defense, the Members will recognize that when we so restrict our crops that it is necessary to import a great quantity of agricultural products we are not developing our own agricultural resources against the day when we may need them. To have true national defense we must not be faced with the necessity of importing foodstuffs but must grow them at home; we must be freed of dependence on a merchant marine to bring us agricultural products from foreign countries. [Applause.] The merchant marine must be otherwise engaged if war should come.

These are merely points that have to do with our national defense. I shall not enlarge on them at this time, but will do so at a later date.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a copy of a letter from the national president of the Workers' Alliance of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would have to submit the request to include other matter when we go back in the House.

Mr. BOREN. I withdraw that part of my request for the moment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill is a very fine piece of work. It covers the field in splendid fashion.

MILLIONS FOR DEFENSE; NOT ONE CENT FOR DEFIANCE

The construction of war planes is an evident necessity for our national defense. More than a year ago the International News Service carried the expression of my views on this subject in relation to a program of aviation training similar to the present program of Reserve officer training in the United States. On the naval bill of last year I was one of those who expressed a wish to see one less battleship built and the use of that \$60,000,000 in the construction of airplanes. I am not unaware of the need of the country for the other equipment for defense, but I am convinced that the next war—and I am dreadfully afraid that the next world war is an almost certain event—will find aviation a far more important factor than we have recognized in our expenditures for the national defense. I recognize the need for an adequate navy, but I remember all the experts before the Naval Affairs Committee last year agreed that one ship near its base was equal to three ships the width of an ocean away from their base; and so if it would take three American ships to defeat one British ship in British waters, the converse is true, and our program should be directed accordingly. I think the determining factor as to what we should do on this and subsequent bills, at least by title "for the national defense," should be based on a clear and definite determination as to whether or not our armaments are to be used on this side of the Atlantic and the Pacific or on the other side. I, for one, am determinedly opposed to the use of our armaments for any purpose other than strictly defensive purposes for the American continents and the insular possessions of the United States.

I would remind you that the price of one battleship would pay the cost of 250 of the largest war planes known to human invention, and it would be hard to convince me that I could not send 250 war planes to the Philippines to sink a single battleship and still be certain of the return of a good proportion of those ships after the destruction of the foe defined.

Our preparations for the national defense cannot be intelligently directed until we first determine the lines of that defense. I am willing to spend millions for the defense of the Americas but not one cent nor one life as a sacrifice to European or Asiatic entanglements. I want the American military branches shod with impregnable materials for defense, but I do not want to give our military establishments seven-league boots with which to step across the Atlantic or Pacific to perpetuate an imaginary diplomatic line of defense, unrecognized by the people of America as their objective and defined by the diplomacy of secrecy and a policy of saber-rattling, unwanted and disapproved by the elected representatives of the people of the United States.

What we want in America is peace. We want to go about our ways unmolested. We want peace built on the quiet self-assurance of our unquestionable ability to defend ourselves against aggressors or invasion of our rights and realms.

Let us once and for all discard the ancient and futile theory of secrecy. Let us define in unquestionable terms what our objectives are; what we will and will not do; what we will and will not permit; let the world and the American people have a frank understanding. We here in the Congress should guarantee to the people of America that the perpetual war taxation in time of peace shall be directed only to the certain arrest of lawless operations against American realms or American rights and liberties. There is no question but that every straight-thinking man, woman, and child in America wants peace. We should let the world know that. There is also no question but that every thinking man, woman, and child in America has the courage and the determination to give his life and his property for the defense of our country if necessity should arise for the physical expression of that courage and determination. The Amer-

ican philosophy is simple and understandable. If I came to your house tonight and you should insult me and order me out of the house I would go without question and without combat. If you should come to my house tonight and insult me and order me out of my house, by the eternal, there would be a different story. This simple philosophy is applicable to the position of the United States in reference to all other countries in the community of nations.

Let us remember that the greatest evil connected with rival armaments is that they destroy the strongest motives for peace. Surely, the World War has given to America some idea of the predisposing power which an immense series of preparations for war has in actually begetting war. Armaments familiarize ideas which lose their horrors. They feed an inward flame of excitement which, when it becomes habitual, produces a loss of consciousness for peace.

Just as I am determined to protect the sanctity of my home, even though I lose my life in that determination, I am determined to protect the security of America and am willing to take all the steps for the security of the Nation which I would take for the security of my home under similar evidences of need, but I must be certain on every piece of legislation that arises here that the adequacy of preparation is determined on the basis of protection insurance only. We are spending this year twice as much in armaments as the war year of 1917-18, and I am obliged to consider whether this war taxation is not required for circumstances and objects far different from those which a time of peace requires.

The evident need for a growth in our military establishments does not convince me that these establishments should become overgrown. I fear that this headlong rush for preparation is seeking military armaments in a proportion which belongs to a state of war rather than a state of peace.

The probability of a World War is evident, and the historic lessons of war must certainly convince us that no matter what result, nothing of any practical value to mankind will be gained by war. I am reminded of Robert Southey's reminiscences on the Battle of Blenheim.

"Now tell us what 'twas all about,"  
Young Peterkin, he cries,  
And little Wilhelmine looks up  
With wonder-waiting eyes—  
"Now tell us all about the war  
And what they killed each other for."  
"It was the English," Kaspar cried,  
"That put the French to rout;  
But what they fought each other for  
I could not well make out."

And again I remember that Alice Corbin says:

If war is right, then God is might  
And every prayer is vain.

Yet we went into the World War in the belief that the war was right. Our entrance was popular in America. We fought in the delusion that the war would make the world safe for democracy, and I repeat today the indisputable fact that nothing of any practical value to America or to mankind was gained by our entrance into that war. The belief that animated the people was that western civilization was threatened in its essential conceptions of individual and political liberty and now, in 1939, as it was a little more than 20 years ago, the same voice is raised with the same cry. Surely the lessons of the last great war are worth a moment's consideration. Do we have to discover many times over again, as we must learn after a war, that little or nothing has been gained by all the fighting?

The Crimean War is an outstanding example of the stupidity of the so-called world diplomacy. Multiplied thousands of lives and multiplied millions of dollars were spent to maintain the mythical balance of power. History has not failed to remind us, also, that wars have been fought to preserve holy places on the theory that there is no better way than using gunpowder and bayonets just to show a Christian nation's religious fervor.

The doctrine of the balance of power has become a tradition of so-called diplomacy and, let me say once and for all,

that I do not care a tinker's dam about maintaining the balance of power in Tunisia or in Hong Kong if it means that we must fortify the island of Guam, shoot another \$20,000,000,000 into hell, and sacrifice another 100,000 lives on the fields of battle. Another thing we have greatly overestimated is the importance of great armaments to see to it that certain capitalists "have a place in the sun" and that the missionaries we do not need at home shall not lose their lives abroad.

The responsibility of America to maintain the balance of power between the so-called democracies and the so-called totalitarian states is simply a new assertion of the ancient myth called balance of power. Millions of lives in many ages have been sacrificed in battle to help pay the bill for maintaining the balance, and now we are told that America must come quickly to the aid of England and France to maintain the balance of power. We sacrificed thousands of lives and spent billions of dollars for England and France some 20 years ago, but I do not see anything in the world that was preserved or maintained as a result of that war to be worth that sacrifice. The balance of power has been constantly shifting, unbalanced throughout the centuries. Never was such a wobbly thing invented to inflict so much misery on mankind.

Let us here today indict the perpetrator of the crime of war. Let us connect so-called diplomacy with the horrors of war, which is diplomacy's premeditated crime. I want it clearly understood that these remarks are not directed against any individual and particularly have no intent to disparage our great Secretary of State, who, in my judgment, is one of the ablest and wisest men that has ever held that high post. Such men, ministers and secretaries of state, are here today and gone in the cycle of tomorrow, but the upstree of traditional diplomacy remains. The utterly false idea that the term diplomacy is synonymous with peace has crept into the minds of the people and there remains. We, in America have accepted the ridiculous propaganda that foreign policy is something too complicated for the understanding of an ordinary citizen. So the machinations of our so-called diplomats seldom reach the mind of the majority of our people. A little while ago the propagandists cited the great achievements of the Lima conference. I feel certain that anyone who is under the impression that the unification of the Americas was accomplished in that conference is greatly misled. I am, personally, of the opinion that the tangle and wrangle of that conference was equal to the quarrels of a pack of fishwives with the exception that there was some suppression and disguise of attitudes and motives.

I believe a great idealism gave birth to the doctrine of collective security and has promoted the subsequent trade agreements of the good-neighbor policy; but, while America has given full faith to these programs, even to the favored-nation endowments, the actions and methods of other countries in relation to us in those agreements are comparable to the old first Mondays in which all the horse traders came to the swapping place and, in this instance, as sometimes occurred there, all profited on an unlearned and unsuspecting buyer. I challenge anyone to show that the bargains of the so-called trade agreements have in any instance satisfied either the seller or the buyer. I am of the opinion also that in the drives of 1940-41, or of whatever period the next great outbreak comes, these treaties will go up in a whirlwind as so many more scraps of paper.

We are about to engage in another great carnage with the whole world, dedicated to the idea that a Hitler or a Mussolini must be subdued because he is a danger to the peace of the world and a menace to democracy. A little more than a century ago the vast majority of the millions of Europe believed it was absolutely necessary for nations to sacrifice thousands of lives and millions of dollars in subduing Napoleon because he was a danger to the peace of the world and a menace to democracy.

A constant carnage and destruction through a score of years covered fields extending from Moscow to Africa and at last the monster was subdued, but the nations did not beat

their swords into plowshares, nor decide battleships would be required no more. If it is our purpose to destroy Hitler or Mussolini, we might direct our efforts against the individual rather than against a nation. Is it not just a little bit silly to remember that millions of people were engaged in an attempt to arrest and bring to justice the Kaiser, who was a danger to the peace of the world and a menace to democracy, and, though the blood of American youth was poured out on European battlefields, that arch criminal lives in peace and quiet, enjoying the comforts and the luxuries of his castle at Doorn?

When all the periodicals and the speakers in America start telling the people that they must fight again for the protection and in the interests of the people, remember that that is what they told us in the World War, while the Kaiser was telling the German boys the same thing, the Czar was telling the same story to the Russians, and the French Government was telling the French people that they should all be slain for their own benefit. Soon they will be telling us that same story. Hitler will be telling it to Germans, Mussolini to Italians, Stalin to Russians, and the French and British Governments to their own people. Just this moment they are repeating the horrid lie that arms in themselves mean peace—a lie that is as old as the ages and that has robbed labor and industry in every nation of the world. It has become a parent to the orphan and consort to the widow of every land and clime.

So-called democracies have always fought presumably for the principles of democracy, and I agree that they are worth fighting for, but I think we could better be putting these principles into practice and in due time the principles will fight for themselves. Let us remember that little more than 100 years ago Great Britain said of Napoleon what she had said of predecessors of Napoleon. Let us remember that a little more than a score of years ago Great Britain said of the Kaiser what she had said of Napoleon, and let us realize that today Great Britain is saying of Hitler what she said of the Kaiser. Let us also remember that Great Britain's seizure of territory throughout the world followed very much the same course in other days which has been followed by these totalitarian states in more recent times. The whole theory of justice to Great Britain seems to be based on the theory that possession is nine points of the law, since Great Britain has taken possession of India, Egypt, and other portions of the globe too numerous to mention.

I doubt if there are any religious persecutions in the world which would justify our militant concern. Let us remember that a great many of those leaders of religious bodies did not hesitate to identify themselves with the business of warfare and its dividends just 20 years ago.

It is well that America consider very carefully the ghastly proportions and possibilities of another war. There never was a single year when Napoleon's government voted even the price of one present-day battleship for total naval purposes. Today a street urchin could tell Napoleon things about explosives and submarines that would make his hair stand on end. Our Americans cannot conceive of the differences of the proportions of war between the time of Napoleon and the present day. It is beyond my imagination to grasp the fact that the total cost of the Revolutionary War, which gave us the land and liberties which we hold dear, was spent in blood and in money in just 4 minutes of the last World War.

And what is the result of these unimaginable costs? The situation of America at the successful close of the World War is worthy of observation. Did peace bring us security? Did peace bring us retrenchment? Did peace bring us relief from burdens? Did peace extend our commerce? Did peace bring us the friendship of the very powers for whom we fought? Did peace bring us wealth, prosperity, and employment?

Of all the countries, the chief one against which we fought has come out of the contest with the least harm.

Now, my colleagues, I wish it were possible for us to put the finger of certainty on our responsible agents, to have every man with any power to entangle us internationally responsible directly to us, who are the selected Representatives of the people of America and who, in turn, are amenable to

their constant wish and are directed to the constant service of their welfare. Let me remind you that we, the elected Representatives of the people, do not even know if there is an alliance between this country and France. When Ambassador Bullitt said last year that the United States and France were defectively united in peace or in war, I wired the Secretary of State, and the subsequent events in that connection speak for themselves. Every American citizen has the right to know every action of this Government in relation to foreign powers. We do not know what secret scraps of paper exist or what secret understandings. You know there has never been anything like "a scrap of paper" for bringing nations at each other's throats either to keep the scrap of paper whole or to tear it to shreds. England and France have always talked big to the United States and have done little. I am of the opinion that had I been a Czechoslovak I would have fought for the independence of my country, but it is also reasonably clear that the imaginary advantage to the world of maintaining the integrity of Czechoslovakia was scarcely of more importance than the peace of Europe.

We fought a war to give some nations illegitimate birth and those nations that were born from the womb of the World War do not necessarily commit the world to war for their preservation, for, fundamentally, they were created by diplomatic deals of which the people of America knew little and cared less. I think if the American people could detach themselves to cool and calm consideration they would prefer peace to the strict observance of treaties made by men who have never consulted the people of America. Another war would simply mean signing away other peoples' rights and the handing of people themselves to a new-born state to which they owe no allegiance.

I have heard a great deal of maintaining diplomatic honor. The value of diplomatic honor in a game that is carried on without the participation of the people means very little to me. America's prestige and honor has been toused a good deal in the course of its history through diplomatic deals unsought by the American people and unappreciated by the other countries affected. To strike straight at the heart of the problem in America today, we must point out that American diplomacy carries on its work in secret and that our foreign affairs are removed from the notice of the general public.

Even Members of Congress, when considering some foreign policy or some act of our Government in international affairs, are often silenced by the reply that "it would not be to the public interest to give out the information." We have built up mysterious walls around our State Department and it sounds damn silly to me to say that the American people have any interest that is best kept unknown to them. It is like the manager of a department store saying to the owner of the firm that he feels it is for his interest not to know what sales are made that day, but at the same time urges the owner to spend a great amount of money in the new purchase of supplies. I am of the opinion that there is a vast danger in allying ourselves with France who, undoubtedly, would be glad to drag us into war with Italy or Germany and who certainly will, sooner or later, take part in a blaze that will sweep all of Europe in a great conflagration. We have loaded our Nation with debt and taxes and sacrificed the lives of thousands of Americans and desolated the homes of thousands of families for France. The result of that profligate expenditure in the last war: On one end of the social scale, millionaires; on the other end, mendicants and multiplied unemployed.

It is debatable whether one generation has the right to impose the obligations of war on the next generation and we have not clearly differentiated between international affairs that directly affect the true interests of the American people and the traffickings which are done in the name of the people without the people's consent. The grave question of our neutrality is in the minds of the statesman and the man in the street. Undoubtedly, we have already departed from strict neutrality, and it is time now that we make a decision as to whether or not we want to guarantee to the American

his place in America or whether we want to assign him to a place in a foreign trench. That decision should be made now and our future actions suited to that decision. As for me, I have decided; I am for defense, not defiance. Millions for defense but not one cent to support foreign entanglements.

This country must not be fettered by secret understandings. We must not have our neutrality destroyed by predilection. I am impressed with the notion that we are committed up to the hilt to support France if she is attacked by a third power. If this is true, our position as a so-called neutral power is ridiculously absurd. Our position appears to be one of secret agreements covered up by diplomatic subterfuge and pretense. The American people are not asses to be hoodwinked by touting diplomats. The policy of the State Department that will permit secret agreements is a most sinister menace to the peace of America. If there are no secret agreements, tacit understandings are equally sinister agents of the historic force known as diplomacy. The American people will support the things that are open and aboveboard and right, but we do not want to be duped.

We are confronted with the most momentous decisions of our generation. No sanctimonious lifting of hands to heaven as though heaven were a colony of America established for the residence of American diplomats can camouflage the truth to my satisfaction. Everybody knows that the people of America have no say as to whether they go to war or not. I do not believe that a popular referendum on that subject is workable, at least not under present facilities for such a referendum and considering conditions that might arise in theoretical circumstances. But certainly, elected representatives of the people should exercise some power over whether this country goes to war or not, because those representatives know what the people of America want and, as a body, will undoubtedly serve the wishes and the welfare of the constituency represented. As I say, everybody knows that the people of America have no voice in whether we go to war or not, but everybody does not know that the representatives of the people, the Congress, has no voice in whether this Nation goes to war or not. You, in the Congress know, though, that we are voiceless on that question. You know that the declaration of war is a formal farce after a state of war already exists. And you know that that state of war is always the result of the actions of the Executive of the Nation and of the State Department? I have a very great admiration and respect for our great President and great Secretary of State. I have confidence in them but that does not mean that I want to abdicate to them on questions of international affairs.

I believe that the people in the Fourth Congressional District of Oklahoma want me to decide in keeping with their interests on questions of international policy. I believe that the people of that great district want national defense but are opposed to entangling us in another European war. I had a good deal of admiration and respect and confidence for Woodrow Wilson, another great President, and William Jennings Bryan, another great Secretary of State; but we all know that the Congress was powerless in the development of those circumstances; we all know that Congress has no voice in the real determination of war or peace. We must either have a determining voice in foreign affairs or we would be better off to abolish the State Department and the systems of so-called diplomacy.

We are in a mad rush of preparations for war. All these preparations parade under the guise of preparations for peace but certainly clear thought can see beyond that mirage. Some of the bills brought in here to increase our national armaments I shall vote for, as I have voted for this bill today to increase the strength of American aviation, but a number of the bills brought in here to expand our armament programs I shall vote against because, as I say, I am willing to spend millions for defense but not one cent for defiance.

While I am thinking about the cost of a battleship, I must necessarily think about the cost of work relief and I must remember the infant mortality, insanity, social diseases, and

unemployment which have been increased by the spending for armaments that led us into the last war, and that the army which we muster into service, battalions for war, leave battalions of unemployed in every town in the land when war is over. I am willing to give careful consideration to the battalions needed in an increased military establishment but I must also think of the battalions in the ranks of the American unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, in my home town there are some 2,000 boys on the verge of maturity. Seminole, Okla., at her own expense, has cared for their health, has nurtured and developed them with difficulty and sorrow, has fed them up to manhood, has invested in their education, has trained them to their crafts and trades; and Seminole needs the income from that investment. It needs their services and their productive activity. It needs the work of their brains and their hands.

I presume, sir, that in some village in Germany there are today 2,000 other youths on the verge of maturity. The village, at her own expense, has cared for their health, has nurtured and developed them with difficulty and sorrow, has fed them up to manhood, has invested in their education, has trained them to their crafts and trades, and this village needs the income from that investment. It needs their services and their productive activity. It needs the work of their brains and their hands. And soon we will have to make a decision as to whether this 2,000 shall meet that 2,000 in deadly combat. Presuming that we dressed our 2,000 in khaki and shipped them away at the public expense 3,000 miles to the shores of the Rhine, and at that same spot they are placed in position opposite to the 2,000 from the German village, and in the combat of war they are destroyed, we must bury them with the tears and the heartaches of the mothers who sacrificed for their birth and development, and instead of 2,000 useful craftsmen for Seminole and 2,000 useful craftsmen for the German village, the world has 4,000 corpses and 10,000 broken hearts. Do these men have any quarrel? Not the smallest. They are the entrest of strangers, and the only relation that exists between them is some mutual helpfulness born of commerce. They are destroyed because of simpleton governments, and such is the history of war.

Do you suppose, Mr. Chairman, that anyone in these Halls has such little regard for the welfare of the communities he represents as to vote for sending these boys from their communities into the situation which I have pictured here? Do you suppose, sir, that the diplomats of the world believe that the peoples of the nations would agree to their perpetrating such a system?

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that in these rambling remarks I have dipped here and there in many phases of the general question of international relationship, but I hope that these somewhat disjointed and unorganized remarks will have reflected at least some glimpses of the thoughts that permeate my days, that haunt my nights, and that burden my prayers in the face of the responsibilities here connected with the close approach of war.

Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this bill because I believe it is money spent for adequate defense but I will vote against any measure that goes beyond the purposes of defense because I am opposed to defiance and aggression.

And may I close these remarks with the reminder that I seldom rise to speak on the floor of the House and that I have no wish to bandy words in the waste of time. What I have said today comes from a heart made heavy by my mind's prophecy of another war, and I hope that my words and actions may contribute something toward directing this Nation away from war.

I charge every American to acquaint himself with the facts that the diplomatic relations of America and of most all the nations of the world are conducted absolutely without responsibility to the peoples of the nations of the world or to their elected representatives, and America is no exception in any sense or application. Our foreign affairs are conducted by agents who have absolutely no tangible responsibility to the people or the representatives of the people of the United States. It is a bad system, so bad that we would be better off to have it destroyed rather than to have it as it is,

Mr. Chairman, I think we are headed for war, but not with my consent, and every step that we take in that direction will be taken over my protest and opposition. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3791) to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

#### CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2728) to add certain lands to the Cleveland National Forest in Orange County, Calif., previously referred to the Committee on Agriculture, may be withdrawn from that committee and re-referred to the Committee on the Public Lands. I may say I have the consent of the chairmen of both of those committees in making this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does that bill cover?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is a bill having to do with acquisition of additional forestry property.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The chairmen of both of these committees have agreed?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Both chairmen have agreed to this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech on Abraham Lincoln made by one of my constituents, Mr. William D. Bosler, who is an authority on Abraham Lincoln's life.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the pending bill today may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein transcript of a conversation between myself and Mr. David Lasser, president of the Workers' Alliance; also a letter from David Lasser to myself in reference to my action in condemning that organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement issued by President Manuel Quezon, of the Philippine Commonwealth, with reference to Jewish refugees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, 1920, the sixteenth amendment became a part of the Constitution of the United States. This was, if you recall, at the end of President Wilson's administration, a Democratic administration. Similar to many other measures enacted under the present administration, the sixteenth amendment was "love's labor lost."

The sixteenth amendment is unusual because it was not needed, and it accomplished only one purpose—that of prohibiting the issuance of tax-exempt securities.

The power to lay and collect taxes has always been a part of the Constitution. I quote article I, section 8, paragraph 1:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

And I quote for comparison amendment 16:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Under section 8 the power to collect taxes is entirely in the hands of Congress, and so is the power to issue tax-exempt securities; but under the sixteenth amendment "taxes on incomes from whatever source derived" conflicts with section 8, because it specifies income, and more or less makes it mandatory upon the Federal Government to collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived; and in such income we may include all securities which have been tax-exempt. Section 8 leaves Congress free to lay taxes for the general welfare of the United States, while amendment 16 ends in a blind alley.

#### INTERPRETATION OF H. R. 3790

Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, on January 19 Congress was informed, in the President's message, that legislation should be enacted to stop the Treasury Department from levying retroactive income taxes on salaries of innocent offenders. On January 30 and February 7, in a discussion before the House, I said the sixteenth amendment did not contain power for retroactive taxation, and that salary was not the same as income, and therefore not subject to income tax. On February 9, H. R. 3790 was introduced and enacted. The bill cancels retroactive taxes on State employees in all departments. If the President was right and believed his own statement, he approved and recommended the passing of an unconstitutional measure.

This bill—H. R. 3790—provides for mutual taxing power between the Federal Government and all the States.

SEC. 3 The United States hereby consents to the taxation of compensation after December 31, 1938.

The States, however, are not asked to give their consent to such unconstitutional invasion of their rights, but it is instead given for them by their own Representatives in Congress. Forty-eight States were sold out to the Federal Government on February 9, 1939.

Since the enactment of H. R. 3790 I can now understand why we are submerged by a mass of ridiculous laws, archaic and incomprehensible. After watching the House enact a most contemptible and unconstitutional measure into our Nation's law, I can foresee only national dissolution from the sheer weight of such legislative stupidity.

Congress alone will be responsible and so held by every American citizen. Opinions expressed on this floor as to the responsibility of Congress astonish me. It appears to me that some Members of this body accept the philosophy that the only duty of Congress is to appropriate money and enact legislation. They seem to forget that Congress is responsible to the people for all Government operations. Congress alone has the power to appropriate money, which is a further evidence of its power, for money is needed to pay the Federal Government's expenses.

Congress should, however, bear in mind that the money appropriated is not earned by the Federal Government but is instead earned by the business people in our country, the people whom Congress represents. They are the same people the Congress is dispossessing of property and the right to earn a living therefrom by placing the Federal Government in direct competition with them. Congress is also responsible for enacting legislation which is now used to dispossess our people of their Government and of their constitutional rights, and which is gradually converting a republican democracy into a totalitarian state.

Congress will also be responsible when this Nation becomes involved in internecine conflict—when we become involved in massive strikes and internal revolution.

Congress will be guilty of an unforgivable crime when our children must fight and die to restore a republican democratic government. I say this because there are too many intelligent men and women in the United States who will not tolerate a dictatorial government. I now say that such plans, while reasonably well camouflaged, are contemplated by someone, and it is the duty of Congress to recognize that threat now. Private corporations now owned and operated by the Federal Government are a part of this plan. H. R. 3790, which was enacted here last Thursday, February 9, is another move to obtain control by the Government. The next and necessary step is to establish control of, and to socialize, or communize, medicine. Federal ownership and control of this well-regulated organization is necessary to establish centralization. Such Federal power of regulation and control enhances its appeal for public support through offers of free medical care and free treatment. That, however, is not the real intention of the secret council, the advisers behind this move. It is more insidious and far-reaching than that. Control of medicine opens private homes to dissemination of false and misleading information, and offers an unparalleled opportunity for propaganda. My colleagues, of course, know that the Federal Government is employing immense publicity organizations in many departments for no other purpose than to shape public opinion.

No one can stop this but Congress, and if my colleagues fail to recognize danger, as they failed last Thursday when they voted "aye" for H. R. 3790, we cannot but betray the American people.

There is not a Member of this House who would not resent the invasion of his home by local government, and fight to keep it free from such intrusion. That is your constitutional right. Last Thursday you denied that right to the States when you enacted H. R. 3790, as requested by the President.

Every State in the Union will resent invasion and destruction of its sovereign rights. No State will capitulate without fighting to protect the liberties and rights of its people and the honor of the State. That is the State's constitutional right. Those who forced the enactment of H. R. 3790 helped to destroy that much-cherished States' right, which is the bond that binds our Union.

Last Thursday the Republican Party and a few Democrats fought bitterly every step against the enactment of this legislation only to meet overwhelming defeat by the New Deal party majority. After fighting a losing battle some of those who had helped in the fight voted for the passage of the bill, not because they believed in it but to please their constituents at home. I was obligated, with the others, to oppose retroactive taxation, but I shall never obligate myself to destroy constitutional government.

Congress has no power to enforce legislation which destroys the rights of the States and which threatens the sovereignty of the States. Realizing this, I voted "no" to H. R. 3790, to protect not only my own State but every State in this Union, and that is the duty of this Congress.

I shall now call my colleagues' attention to the President's message of January 19, 1939. The first eight paragraphs of this message deal generally with the taxing of Federal, State, or municipal obligations. From paragraph 1 of the President's message I quote:

I urged that the time had come when private income should not be exempt either from Federal or State income tax simply

because such private income is derived as interest from Federal, State, or municipal obligations, or because it is received as compensation for services rendered to the Federal, State, or municipal governments.

H. R. 3790 did not touch upon this phase of taxing, and under the sixteenth amendment, all income from Federal and municipal bonds is still taxable under the sixteenth amendment. This cannot be changed by any act of Congress or decision of the Supreme Court. It can only be changed by a constitutional amendment. Note, however, that retroactive taxes cannot be levied or collected under the sixteenth amendment.

Title II of H. R. 3790 sets aside retroactive collection of taxes on the salaries of State employees only, before January 1, 1938. It did not change or influence the sixteenth amendment in any manner, but is instead an amendment to section 22 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1938, an act which in itself is unconstitutional.

I said in a previous discussion before this House that the sixteenth amendment does not provide for taxation upon salaries but only upon income from whatever source derived. If this is not true, why is special reference made to tax on salaries in the Revenue Act of 1938 and in H. R. 3790? The title of H. R. 3790 is: "That this act may be cited as the 'Public Salary Tax Act of 1939,'" and I now quote section 22 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1938, as amended:

"Gross income" includes gains, profits, and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal service (including personal service as an officer or employee of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing), of whatever kind and in whatever form paid, or sales, or dealings in property, whether real or personal, growing out of the ownership, or use of, or interest in such properties; also from interest, rent, dividends, securities, or the transaction of any business carried on for gain or profit, or gains or profits and income derived from any source whatever. In the case of Presidents of the United States and judges of courts of the United States taking office after July 6, 1932, the compensation received as such shall be included in gross income; and all acts fixing the compensation of such Presidents and judges are hereby amended accordingly.

The sixteenth amendment reads:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration.

If the sixteenth amendment had read "taxes on incomes and salaries from whatever source derived," section 22 of the Revenue Act of 1938 would have been unnecessary.

In the President's message to Congress January 19, 1939, he said—paragraph 8:

Unless the Congress passes some legislation dealing with this situation prior to March 15, I am informed by the Secretary of the Treasury that he will be obliged to collect back taxes for at least 3 years upon the employees of many State agencies and upon the security holders of many State corporate instrumentalities, who mistakenly but in good faith believed they were tax exempt. The assessment and collection of these taxes will doubtlessly in many cases produce great hardship.

Paragraph 9:

Accordingly, I recommend legislation to correct the existing inequitable situation, and at the same time to make private income from all Government salaries hereafter earned and from all Government securities hereafter issued subject to the general income-tax laws of the Nation and of the several States. It is difficult for almost all citizens to understand why a constitutional provision permitting taxes on "income from whatever source derived" does not mean "from whatever source derived."

If "income" is synonymous with "salary," and so held by the Constitution, as the President and Secretary of the Treasury claim to believe, why did Congress enact the Revenue Act of 1938, and, if the sixteenth amendment has retroactive taxing power, as the President and the Secretary of the Treasury claim it has, why did the President recommend the passing of H. R. 3790 to cancel such retroactive taxing power, a clearly unconstitutional procedure? As a matter of fact, no one should get very much disturbed about it because the sixteenth amendment never had retroactive taxing power, and it has not been changed by this act.

The title of H. R. 3790, which is "Public Salary Tax Act," should be changed to read, "The Internecion Tax Act," for

it is that and nothing else. First, when the Federal Government and State governments begin to tax each other, the end of free government is near. It can only terminate in vicious taxing between governments, and no doubt will end in dissension, strife, and even loss of life. Second, it is a direct attack on the sovereignty of the States by Federal invasion and taxing of all State employees, a clear violation of amendments 9 and 10 in the Bill of Rights.

Contrary to the President's opinion many people understand the Constitution. They should because it is for their own protection. The people understand that the President obligates himself to "preserve, protect, and defend" their law, the Constitution. And they also understand that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

In paragraph 8 the President referred to those "who mistakenly but in good faith believe they were tax exempt." The people are not mistaken, but the Government is. For tax-exempt securities are issued to the people by the Government so Congress can borrow money on the credit of the United States. I realize that exemption of such income is in violation of the sixteenth amendment, but it cannot be blamed on the people.

To force bills through Congress is easy because of its personnel and the position its Members take in relation to the President. It is hazardous for a Member to question constitutionality without inviting ridicule or patient toleration for every one lives in dread of the opinion of the Supreme Court. Yet the Supreme Court is by no means infallible. Its split decisions are evidence of that. The proper thing, of course, would be for Congress to pass on the constitutionality of all legislation. But how can anyone expect a Member to interpose his own opinion when some day he might otherwise be eligible for a district or Supreme Court judgeship?

The psychology of Congress favors the passing of all legislation if it is recommended by the President, the Attorney General, or some department having access to proper advice. It seems to be easier to do that than it would be to lock up the constitutionality of the proposed measure, as should be done by every Member of Congress. I can find no better example nor more recent one than H. R. 3790. Whoever drafted this resolution endeavors to prove its right of existence, not upon the Constitution but, instead, upon a decision rendered in the case of *Helvering v. Gerhardt* (304 U. S. 405). This decision is incorporated in H. R. 3790, and is used to establish the right of retroactive taxing. No further evidence is required than this to show that Congress relies upon decisions of the courts to prove constitutionality instead of upon the Constitution itself.

Many seem to forget that decisions involving a constitutional question must not be based upon previous decisions, but, instead, upon the Constitution itself. If everyone adhered to that, no doubt there would be only a few split decisions on this issue. It would certainly be a blessing to the American Nation, because we are overburdened with unconstitutional laws, and that in reality is the cause of our trouble today. We have a massive legal structure, too cumbersome and too costly to administer, full of restrictions, so that our own people become victims of persecution by their own laws.

Let us review the past so as to get straight on this issue. All of you, of course, are aware of the tremendous publicity bureau which is operating in Washington to shape public opinion in favor of the administration. I cannot but compliment this organization on its success. Early last year information leaked out inadvertently, as is customary, that the Treasury Department contemplated taxing back salaries of State employees. They, of course, became more or less disturbed about it, and rightly so, because their salaries cannot withstand such extra taxes. The purpose of this propaganda was to start a flow of resolutions to Representatives in Congress against such law. I received many of them and I am sure that others were equally well supplied. Members of Congress immediately stepped up in front and said, "We are opposed to it. Don't you folks at home worry about it, because we will fight against it." This is the beginning. On

January 19, 1939, the President in his message said that if a law were not passed to stop it the Secretary of the Treasury would be forced to collect back taxes for at least 3 years. That was all. Some more resolutions came in and powerful support was indicated in favor of the enactment of legislation against retroactive taxation.

Now, another pause and a measure comes to the House in the form of H. R. 3790, not to stop retroactive taxation, except as a gesture, but instead to tax the salaries of all State employees, who had never been taxed before. That was not all. It knocked the sovereignty of the States into a cocked hat, and I do not believe a State in the Union will submit to this measure.

If the Members of Congress had read the Constitution, I do not believe the measure would have passed; but the stage was set by the secret propaganda council and the President favored the passage of the bill. It was enacted by a large majority. But remember, it did not change the retroactive taxing power for that never existed in the sixteenth amendment or anywhere else in the Constitution. It did violate the ninth, tenth, and the sixteenth amendments. It violated the ninth and tenth because the Federal Government invades the States' domain and the sovereign rights of the States. It violated the sixteenth amendment because it repealed retroactive taxes on the salaries of State employees. The Government has not observed the sixteenth amendment because it has failed to collect taxes on income from whatever source derived; namely, Federal, State, and municipal bonds, the so-called tax-exempt securities held by private investors.

Today the newspapers are full of war news and the State Department is beating the war drums. The State and other departments talk about foreign governments and meddle in their affairs, while their own Government is tottering and wobbling on the mountain of unsound policies. Congress sits here and lays golden eggs for the wonder boys who run the Government by graphs, charts, and statistics. They are the boys who make the profit on paper and balance budgets by borrowing more money on the credit of the United States. We seem to be unable to determine whether legislation is constitutional, and the Supreme Court fails to do any better, judging by the mass of unconstitutional and unsound legislation now in force.

Can we reach a department head on the phone? No. They are either too important or too busy to be bothered with Members of Congress. They seem to live in a world of their own and are using the Representatives in Congress for a convenience to them. It is even difficult to reach the third and fourth assistant secretaries of the various departments and multitudinous bureaus. The best the Members of Congress can do is to talk to the telephone operator in the office, and she does not know what it is all about. We have a vacuolated Capital, swarming with jaywalkers. One wonders where they all came from. Congress is stampered into acquiescence by some unknown force and enacts unsound and unconstitutional legislation of which H. R. 3790 is an example. The majority in Congress seems to believe that it is representing the President and the New Deal party instead of the people in the United States, who are not only paying the salary of Congress but all other expenses as well. It is my desire to warn this body that if Congress does not take an interest, the Nation is going to explode, and for that no one will be responsible except the Congress of the United States.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOOK, for 4 days, on account of important business.  
To Mr. CHANDLER, for 2 days, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.), pursuant to the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 15, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will continue Wednesday, February 15, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation, in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the committee rooms in the Capitol, Wednesday, February 15, 1939, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 3655—classification and grading of Foreign Service personnel.

### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 15, 1939. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Mr. John N. Beall, a representative of the American Trucking Association, will be the witness.

### COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, February 15, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of continuing the consideration of H. R. 2880, "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," carrying out partially the recommendations of the Hepburn report.

### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in room 446, House Office Building, Wednesday, February 15, 1939, for the public consideration of bills H. R. 805 and H. R. 2846.

### COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Wednesday, February 15, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 2184, H. R. 2317, H. R. 2957, H. R. 2958, H. R. 2959, H. R. 2960.

### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Thursday, February 16, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., to hold hearings on the report on Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ind.

### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in room 213, House Office Building, Thursday, February 16, 1939, at 10 a. m., for the public consideration of H. R. 3230.

### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 21, 1939, on the bill (H. R. 3576) to make effective the provisions of the Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936.

It is contemplated that the hearing on Tuesday, February 21, 1939, on H. R. 3576 will deal particularly with legislation necessary to make effective the provisions of the treaty and problems arising in connection with the provisions of the treaty.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

Tuesday, March 14, 1939:

H. R. 180, H. R. 202, construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 201, additional facilities for Panama Canal; H. R. 2667, construction of a Mexican Canal.

In listing the bills to be heard on March 14, 1939, House Joint Resolution 112 (TINKHAM), to create a commission to study and report on the feasibility of constructing the Mexican Canal, was inadvertently omitted from the notice,

This is to advise all interested parties that House Joint Resolution 112 will be considered at that time with the following bills: H. R. 180 (IZAC), relative to the construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 202 (BLAND), relative to the construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 201 (BLAND), need for additional lock facilities at Panama; H. R. 2667 (TINKHAM), relative to the construction of a Mexican Canal.

Tuesday, March 21, 1939:

H. R. 137, H. R. 980, H. R. 1674, relating to annuities for Panama Canal construction force.

Thursday, March 23, 1939:

H. R. 139, H. R. 141, H. R. 142, H. R. 1819, miscellaneous Panama Canal bills.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

417. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Director of the Geological Survey, under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, to acquire certain collections for the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

418. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to grant privileges, leases, and permits to all lands and buildings under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

419. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to establish load lines for American vessels"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

420. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the withdrawals and restorations contemplated by the act authorizing the President of the United States to withdraw public lands in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2200. A bill to dispense with particular allegations as to renunciation of allegiance in petitions for naturalization and in the oath of renunciation of foreign allegiance, by omitting the name of "the prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty" of which the petitioner for naturalization is a subject or citizen; with amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3617) granting a pension to Calvin J. Pope; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 2615) granting a pension to Venia Moody; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2473) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Kemp; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3891) granting a pension to Elvira M. Birker; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 2465) granting a pension to Herman Acty; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2472), granting a pension to Fred B. Tawes; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2448) granting an increase of pension to Mertie Lorain Anderson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1550) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Popejoy; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 651) granting a pension to Laura B. Poore; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 4073. A bill to create the office of military secretary to the General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOLTON:

H. R. 4074. A bill to correct the naval records of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 4075. A bill to amend paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 15 of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 15); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4076. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States" (U. S. C., title 15, ch. 6, sec. 262); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland:

H. R. 4077. A bill to amend paragraph (2) of section 13 of part I of the Interstate Commerce act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 13); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:

H. R. 4078. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument in Baltimore, Md., in honor of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4079. A bill to amend sections 4353 and 4355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 4080. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 4081. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured from the Government on Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. IGLESIAS:

H. R. 4082. A bill to amend the act of August 14, 1935, entitled "Social Security Act," to extend titles I, V, VI, and X to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 4083 (by request). A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men or former enlisted men of the United States Navy for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane at the submarine base, New London, Conn., on September 21, 1938; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4084 (by request). A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4085. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing agents and employees of the Indian Service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4086. A bill to amend sections 811 (b) and 907 (c) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4087 (by request). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, so as to confer on the commanding general, General Headquarters Air Force, the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by chiefs of branches; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 4088. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to extend its provisions to fats and oils, cottonseed, cottonseed meal, and peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4089. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide annuities for individuals who are totally and permanently disabled and have completed 20 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4090. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RISK:

H. R. 4091. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital and domiciliary facility within and for the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. R. 4092. A bill to establish a Board of Civil Service Appeal and to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field service," approved March 4, 1923, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 4093. A bill to fix the compensation of substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 4094. A bill to amend an act known as the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 so as to provide that the Tennessee Valley Authority reimburse certain county, or counties, in the United States for loss of taxable values by reason of the purchase of the electrical properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. R. 4095. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the admission of Wyoming into the Union as the first State guaranteeing equal suffrage to women; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4096. A bill to credit the Crow Indian tribal funds with certain amounts heretofore expended from tribal funds on irrigation works of the Crow Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4097. A bill to authorize the use of certain facilities of national parks and national monuments for elementary school purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 4098. A bill relating to making the Government-owned motor-vehicle service a permanent branch of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CALDWELL:

H. R. 4099. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the construction of various projects at Fort Barrancas, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 4100. A bill to amend the naturalization laws in relation to an alien previously lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence and who is temporarily absent from the United States solely in his or her capacity as a regularly ordained clergyman or representative of a recognized religious denomination or organization existing in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H. R. 4101. A bill to amend sections 211, 211 (a), 213, 216, 216 (a), 223, 225 (c) and (d) of chapter 6, title 28, of the Code of Laws of the United States, as amended, relating to the United States Circuit Courts of Appeals; and to amend chapter 10, title 28, of the Code of Laws of the United States, as amended, by adding thereto section 403; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4102. A bill to provide for the coinage of fractional minor coins; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4103. A bill to amend section 204 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as amended; and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SACKS:

H. R. 4104. A bill to establish a Racing Board in the District of Columbia; to provide for the licensing of horse-racing meets where the pari-mutuel system of wagering thereon may be conducted; and to levy a license fee and tax on same; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4105. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States, approved March 4, 1909" (35 Stat. L. 1134), and an act which is an amendment thereto, approved March 4, 1921, amending sections 232, 233, 234, 235, and 236 of such act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States, approved March 4, 1909, which supplementary amending act was approved March 4, 1921, by amending section 233; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 4106. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1512); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 4107. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to include in annual budgets for the Government expenses an annual appropriation for adult education in evening colleges or evening high schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 4108 (by request). A bill to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 4109. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite coal industry by providing for the establishment of a research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite region for research studies relating to the development of new uses, markets, and outlets for anthracite coal, and matters pertaining thereto; and to further provide for the safety and health in anthracite coal mining; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution defining the term "gratuity" when used in connection with offsets of the Government against Indian claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution relating to the employment or maintenance of unemployed veterans of the Spanish-American and World Wars; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to authorize the admission into the United States of a limited number of German refugee children; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. Res. 93. Resolution providing that the Senate be requested to return the bill H. R. 3790 to the House of Representatives for such further consideration as the House of Representatives may deem proper; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 94. Resolution raising the question of the privilege of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5, with reference to S. 1030 and S. 1049 concerning lands and buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Resolution H with reference to embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 1 with reference to national old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 7 with reference to farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 8 concerning appropriations under farm-forestry acts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 7, with reference to the beet-sugar industry in Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 1, with reference to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 4, with reference to General Welfare Act of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, with reference to Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Resolution No. 24, with reference to the Dies committee on un-American activities; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 5, with reference to the Coronado Cuatro Centennial Celebration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, concerning solemn tribute to the memory of the Honorable Frederick Steiwer; to the Committee on Memorials.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri:

H. R. 4110. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Miceli; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4111 (by request). A bill for the relief of Rolph J. Lackner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4112. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Joseph Pellon; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTON:

H. R. 4113. A bill for the relief of Maude Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4114. A bill for the relief of Willie Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4115. A bill for the relief of W. C. and James Latane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4116. A bill for the relief of Irene Polos; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 4117. A bill to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4118. A bill for the relief of Superior Iron & Wire Works; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4119. A bill for the relief of Robert John Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4120. A bill for the relief of Mike Mozernik; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. R. 4121. A bill for the relief of C. W. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4122. A bill granting an increase of pension to Minnie Wetmore Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. R. 4123. A bill for the relief of Capt. Charles E. Gerlach; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4124. A bill for the relief of Hilbert R. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 4125. A bill for the relief of Leslie J. Frane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUYER of Kansas:

H. R. 4126. A bill for the relief of Warren Zimmerman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4127. A bill granting an increase of pension to Perry O. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARNESS:

H. R. 4128. A bill granting a pension to Sarah E. Goine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 4129. A bill granting a pension to Josie Sebrell Rayburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4130. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 4131 (by request). A bill for the relief of Melvin Gerard Alvey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4132 (by request). A bill for the relief of Andrew J. Crockett and Walter Crockett; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4133 (by request). A bill for the relief of Joseph N. Thiele; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD:

H. R. 4134. A bill for the relief of Frank Peters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4135. A bill for the relief of Edward B. Weidner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS:

H. R. 4136. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frank V. Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 4137. A bill for the relief of John R. Holt; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4138. A bill to refund to the Railway Mail Mutual Benefit Association certain taxes erroneously collected; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4139. A bill for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4140. A bill for the relief of Harry Comber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONKIEWICZ:

H. R. 4141. A bill for the relief of Celia Press, Bernard Press, Ethel Press, and Marion Press; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 4142. A bill for the relief of Mary Reid Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4143. A bill for the relief of George Francis Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 4144. A bill for the relief of Vincent and Gladys Gowen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4145. A bill for the relief of Sanford N. Schwartz; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PIERCE of New York:

H. R. 4146. A bill granting a pension to Ida M. Hoyt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4147. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4148. A bill for the relief of Mary S. Arthur, as executrix of the estate of Richard M. Arthur, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RISK:

H. R. 4149. A bill for the relief of Manuel Soares; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4150. A bill for the relief of Ilija Rasheta; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 4151. A bill for the relief of Mary Egan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 4152. A bill granting a pension to Flora Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4153. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado:

H. R. 4154. A bill for the relief of Dr. W. Claude Copeland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 4155. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Brummal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4156. A bill granting a pension to Maude E. Boyden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4157. A bill authorizing the appointment of John Sneed Adams as a second lieutenant in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4158. A bill for the relief of J. A. Cearly; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4159. A bill for the relief of L. M. Brendle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4160. A bill for the relief of Burt Savage; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4161. A bill for the relief of Thelma Carringer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4162. A bill for the relief of Angel Hospital and other parties; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4163. A bill for the relief of Frederick Rush; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4164. A bill for the relief of Charles Donaldson Cameron; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. R. 4165. A bill for the relief of John R. Parkhurst; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1058. By Mr. ANDERSON of California; Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to enact legislation to secure all aged citizens against want or poverty by means of a system of Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1059. By Mr. BARTON: Petition of Mrs. G. Strumpen-Darrie and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1060. Also, petition of Helen Lloyd and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1061. Also, petition of Harry Ferguson and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1062. Also, petition of Willis Browne and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1063. Also, petitions of Brigid Lee, Edward J. Lee, Ellen Hollenbeck, B. Farrey, Mary E. Bonn, Mary Shanahan, Helen C. Hayes, Margaret Hughes, and Mary E. Mulligan, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1064. Also, petition of Ruth Slavin and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1065. Also, petition of Martin and Mary Burns and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1066. Also, petition of Joseph McInerney and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1067. Also, petition of Edward Clutterbuck and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1068. Also, petition of Mary Daly and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to

the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1069. Also, petition of B. J. Cassidy and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1070. Also, petition of R. J. Keegean and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1071. Also, petition of Louis Vitiello and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1072. Also, petition of Joseph Paul Thompson and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1073. Also, petition of Theodore McGinley and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1074. Also, petition of John Fitzpatrick and other residents of New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1075. Also, petition of Albert L. Weissenger and other members of the Republican Club of 1819 Broadway, New York City, urging the adherence by the United States to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on the statute books the further principle contained in the act of May 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1076. By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Petition of 1,200 residents of the town of Marblehead, Mass., believing that the underlying principles of House bill 4199 of the Seventy-fifth Congress and the conversion of those principles into law by the Seventy-sixth Congress will go a long way toward a solution of the national economic and welfare problems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1077. By Mr. BURDICK: House resolution H of the twenty-sixth legislative assembly, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1078. Also, senate concurrent resolution No. 67 of the twenty-sixth legislative assembly, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1079. Also, senate resolution No. C of the twenty-sixth legislative assembly, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1080. Also, senate concurrent resolution No. 64 of the twenty-sixth legislative assembly, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1081. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of 706 members of the Soldiers and Sailors Home, Quincy, Ill., urging legislation for a pension sufficient to enable them to live anywhere they choose and thereby eliminate Government homes for veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1082. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., urging lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1083. By Mr. GEYER of California: Resolution from Cannery Workers Union, No. 20147, American Federation of

Labor, Evelyn Hills, secretary, asking that a marine hospital be constructed in the harbor area of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1084. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Townsend Club, No. 5, and Townsend Club, No. 14, of York, Pa., signed by President Charles M. Hershey and President August F. Herman, respectively; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1085. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and Congress to enact legislation to secure all aged citizens against want or poverty by means of a system of Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1086. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of the House of Representatives of the State Legislature of Texas, favoring the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and prevention of the settlement of penniless, homeless, and destitute aliens in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1087. Also, petition of R. L. Wallace, of Coolidge, Tex., favoring House bill 2842, which has to do with telephone exchanges having 1,000 or less subscribers, and modifies the wage and hour law so as to make it possible for these small exchanges to continue to employ telephone operators as they have in the past; to the Committee on Labor.

1088. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of residents of Los Angeles, relative to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1089. Also, petition of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, relative to naming the lake to be created by the construction of the Shasta Dam at Kennett, Shasta County, Calif., "McCull Lake"; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1090. Also, resolution of the Tulare Chamber of Commerce, Tulare, Calif., relative to amending the Bankhead Act of 1934; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1091. Also, resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, relative to exemption from taxation of bonds issued by governmental agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1092. Also, resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, relative to the protection, use, and development of the natural resources of the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1093. Also, resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, relative to amending the California Indian Jurisdictional Act of 1928; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1094. Also, resolution of the City Council of the City of Long Beach, opposing the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 24; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1095. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of 287 residents of the Ninth Congressional District, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Patman anti-chain-store bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1096. By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: House Joint Resolution No. 3, of the Thirty-second General Assembly of Colorado, petitioning enactment of Senate bill 800; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures.

1097. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 4 of the Thirty-second General Assembly of Colorado, urging the Congress to consider General Welfare Act of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1098. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of 51 members of St. Anthony's Holy Name Society, Jersey City, N. J., petitioning Congress, for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1099. By Mr. ROCKEFELLER: Petition of Rev. William T. F. Dooley, Holy Name Rectory, Kingston, N. Y., and 300 citizens of Ulster County, N. Y., opposing the lifting of the embargo on Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1100. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of Local No. 548, International Hod Carriers' Building and Commor. La-

borers' Union of America, Nashville, Ill., Charles Wilkey, Jr., secretary, urging Congress to adopt the Townsend plan as proposed in House bill 2; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1101. By Mr. SHANLEY: Petition of Russell Council, No. 65, of the Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., concerning the embargo on Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1102. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution passed by both the Assembly and Senate of the California State Legislature, urging the Secretary of Labor of the United States to settle the existing uncertainties as to the citizenship status of the said Harry Bridges without further delay, by making a full report upon this subject to the President and to the Congress of the United States, and to instigate in the matter such appropriate action, if any, as may be indicated to be proper by the findings set forth in such report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1103. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the members of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, at a regular meeting held at the courthouse, Newark, N. J., February 2, 1939, urging that the Dies committee be authorized to continue the activities and investigations heretofore accomplished, and that said committee may be given not only necessary financial aid to efficiently carry out this great work but that it should also receive the patriotic approval and support of the American people to the end that these persons, interests, and groups whose efforts and desires are designed to promote discord, impair the efficiency of our Government, to create class hatred, or to do any and all which are inimical to the best interests of the people and Government of the United States, shall be destroyed or driven from our shores; to the Committee on Rules.

1104. Also, letter from John A. Logan Council, No. 6, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., commending the good work of Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS in regard to the investigation of Secretary of Labor Perkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1105. Also, resolution of Dupage County executive committee, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, endorsing the demand of the national commander of the American Legion that the Secretary of Labor be impeached for causes incident to the failure to deport Communist Harry Bridges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1106. Also, letter from H. L. Harms, commander, Santa Barbara Post, No. 49, American Legion, Department of California, with a membership of 800 World War veterans, congratulating Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS for courageous action in bringing impeachment proceedings against the Secretary of Labor and her aids for their absolute neglect of their constitutional oath by protecting convicted aliens who are illegally in this country and who advocate the overthrow of our country by violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1107. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of the Fort Fetter Post, No. 516, Hollidaysburg, Pa., American Legion, favoring the construction of a canal across Nicaragua, so as to permit protecting our shores on both oceans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1108. By Mr. WELCH: Joint Resolution No. 10 of the California State Assembly, relative to Federal appropriations for relief in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1109. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Army Medical Library and Museum at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1110. Also, petition of the American Indian Federation, Miami, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to un-American activities in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

1111. Also, petition of the Aviation Defense Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Aviation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1112. Also, petition of Jesies Ramos, Bayamon, P. R., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1113. Also, petition of C. W. Caylor, of Empire, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1114. Also, petition of C. E. Cook, of Denai, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Father, we praise Thee that the light of another day has broken on our mortal vision. Duties await us; responsibilities are upon us. May the words of our mouth and the meditations of our heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer.

*Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.*

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the morning press carries the account of the meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami, Fla., on yesterday, at which time they issued what is to my mind a momentous statement on the economic conditions of the country. The American Federation of Labor, long a potent factor in advancing the cause of the workers of America, represents the great conservative opinion of American labor. The statement of Mr. Green representing the council follows hereafter. I was particularly impressed with his statement that it is the duty of the Government to remove "fear, lack of confidence, and distrust from the path of industrial expansion." Also the statement "we cannot accept the reasoning of those who maintain that we must prepare to maintain constantly an army of unemployed as the wards of the Government." Mr. Speaker, this statement coming from the ranks of labor is significant. It is also fundamentally true.

In line with this sentiment, I take the liberty of quoting from a speech I made in the House of Representatives on April 4, 1938, when the House had under consideration the reorganization bill. I quote a brief paragraph from that speech:

Increased costs of Government mean an added burden to every citizen of our land from the highest to the humblest. Every workman bending under the burden of the costs of living; every housewife as she goes to market; every farmer as he strives to overcome a disjointed economic order, pays tribute to the tax gatherer as he passes among us to collect his toll. Nothing we could do would so quickly bring back confidence and start anew the wheels of progress as to make a real serious effort to set our financial house in order. Nothing we could do would bring such a sense of security to our workers as to reassure business and industry that we meant what we said about reducing the burdensome costs of Government.

Events which have transpired since the date of this speech convinces me that nothing we can do would be so helpful to American labor as to set about seriously to stabilize our economic conditions so that the workers would be called back to